Vol. LXXV, No. 2 August, 1926

The Ecclesiastical Review

Monthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

CONTENTS

THE PRIEST'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PSYCHO-ANALYSIS 113
The Rev. CHARLES MENIG, Ph.D., Tipton, Kansas.
PREACHING TO CHILDREN 125
The Right Rev. Monsignor H. T. HENRY, Litt.D., Washington, D. C.
ARE PROTESTANT BAPTISMS ORDINARILY VALID? 136
The Rev. VALENTINE SCHAAF, O.F.M., J.C.D., Catholic University of America.
MONARCHS OF THE CAMPUS 151
THE ARCHBISHOP'S POCKET-BOOK. XI. Young Father Gleeson. 160
MARYKNOLL MISSION LETTERS 170
The Rev. JOSEPH A. SWEENEY, A.F.M., Hikon, China.
THE EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS AND THE "GOTHIC" VESTMENT 174
DE OFFICIIS ET JURIBUS PAROCHI RELIGIOSI JUXTA NORMAS A JURE NOVISSIMO LATAS 176
Father IVO VITALI, O.F.M., New York City.
THE CHURCH AND RURAL LIFE PROBLEMS IN THE MIDWEST 180
PASTOR RURICOLA.
SALE OF INDULGENCED OBJECTS 187
THE "MISSA PRO POPULO" IN A VACANT PARISH 189
POPULARIZING THE NUPTIAL MASS 190
The Rev. K. WOHLFAHRT, St. Paul, Minnesota.
RECENT THEOLOGY 192
The Rev. FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R., Esopus, New York.

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

PUBLISHED AT
113 E. Chestnut Street
Lancaster, Pa.

THE DOLPHIN PRESS
Philadelphia

GENERAL OFFICES
1305 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1926: American Ecclesiastical Review—The Dolphin Press

Subscription Price: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional

Sole Agents { Great Britain: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 8 Paternoster Row, London, E. C., 4
Ireland: Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, 24 Upper O'Connell St., Dublin
Australia: W. P. Linehan, 8 Bourke St., Melbourne

Entered, 2 July, 1924, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879

Altar Wine Supremacy

SINCE 1877

The COVICK Altar Wines are produced in California and are the only wines having the unqualified approval and commendation of all the Bishops of California.

✢ ✢ ✢

The Chancellor of the San Francisco Archdiocese supervises the making and distribution of the COVICK wines under the authority of His Grace the Most Reverend Archbishop.

The COVICK wines are not only valid and licit matter for the Holy Sacrifice; they are mature wines of the very highest grade and dependability.

✢ ✢ ✢

The COVICK altar wines, because of their rich mellow wholesome character are the ideal wines for the fasting priest and no wines anywhere in America are comparable with them.

✢ ✢ ✢

The T. F. Rodden Agency
25 Barclay Street
New York City, N. Y.

The I. Donnelly Company
408–410 East Ninth Street
Kansas City, Mo.

Fee Brothers
21–27 North Water Street
Rochester, N. Y.

William Moran Agency
873 Payne Avenue
St. Paul, Minn.

J. Redmond Covick
33 South Wells Street
Chicago, Ill.

Sievers Church Goods Co.
228 East Commerce Street
San Antonio, Texas

or direct from

The Covick Company, 330 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Cal.

The Covick Company

Established 1877 **Incorporated 1900**

BROTHERHOOD CORPORATION

L. L. FARRELL (President)

Vineyards:

Washingtonville, Est. 1839
Livermore, California

Address all communications to:

New York Office
71 Barclay Street

The Brotherhood is one of the oldest and largest Altar wine houses in this country. We allow no dealers to handle our Altar wines, all shipments being made direct to the Reverend Clergy from our vineyards at Washingtonville, New York.

Mr. L. L. Farrell, the President, has devoted his entire life to the Altar wine industry, and all shipments are made under his personal supervision.

Requests for price lists and application blanks will have prompt attention

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

Maryknoll Mission Letters. (*The Rev. Joseph A. Sweeney, A.F.M., Hikon, Korea.*) 170
The Eucharistic Congress and the "Gothic" Vestment 174
De Officiis et Juribus Parochi Religiosi juxta Normas a Jure Novissimo Latas. (*Father Ivo Vitali, O.F.M., New York City.*) 176
The Church and Rural Life Problems in the Midwest. (*Pastor Ruricola.*) 180
Casus Restitutionis 185
Sale of Indulgenced Objects 187
Resignation of the Pastoral Charge 188
The "Missa pro Populo" in a Vacant Parish 189
Transfer of Stations of the Cross 189
Popularizing the Nuptial Mass. (*The Rev. K. Wohlfahrt, St. Paul, Minn.*) 190
Recent Pontifical Appointments 191
Place of Gould-Castellane Marriage 191

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:

Recent Theology. (*The Rev. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., Esopus, N. Y.*) 192

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:

Farges-Jacques: Mystical Phenomena. 201
Frazier: The Worship of Nature 204
Selbst: Handbuch zur Biblischen Geschichte 207
Ferreres: Casus Conscientiae 208
Pègues: Summa Theologica 209
Maréchal: Le Point de Départ de la Métaphysique 210
Umbach: Compendium Theologiae Moralis 211
Frank: Philosophia Naturalis 212
Schurhammer: The Way of the Gods in Japan 214
M. M. Germaine: When the World was White with May 215

LITERARY CHAT 216
BOOKS RECEIVED 220

ESSENTIALIA PHILOSOPHIAE

Quae in Usum Incipientium Digessit
FRANCISCUS P. SIEGFRIED
in Seminario S. Caroli Borromaei Philadelphiense Professor

Pocket Summary of Catholic Philosophy, giving the essentials of **Logic, Ontology, Cosmology, Psychology, Theodicy, Ethics,** briefly, clearly, in form of question and answer.
All set forth in graphic survey. For students of Philosophy in the Seminary and for maturer students who desire to make a rapid review of their Philosophy.

$1.80 a copy postpaid

American Ecclesiastical Review 1305 Arch Street, Philadelphia

IN the REVIEW advertisements, which are fresh each month, there is much of personal interest and of news value to the subscribers. Many of the advertisers send a change of picture and of copy for each issue, and the illustrations show the improvement that is being constantly made in ecclesiastical designing and furnishing. More and more, priests are coming to recognize this feature of the magazine, and it is gratifying to know that, when they have occasion to order from the houses that address them through the REVIEW, they say that they saw the advertisement in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Firms with Episcopal Authorization to Handle Sacred Vessels to Repair Them

BALTIMORE:	JOHN MURPHY CO., Park Avenue and Clay Street.
BOSTON:	BIGELOW KENNARD & CO., 511 Washington Street. THOS. J. FLYNN & CO., 62-64 Essex Street. MATTHEW F. SHEEHAN COMPANY, 17 and 19 Beach St. PATRICK J. GILL, 387 Washington Street.
CHICAGO:	BENZIGER BROTHERS, 205-207 W. Washington Street. (Factory in De Kalb Avenue and Rockwell Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.) JOHN P. DALEIDEN CO., 1530-32 Sedgwick Street. ECCLESIASTICAL GOODS CO., 984 Milwaukee Ave. D. B. HANSEN & SONS, 27 N. Franklin Street. EDWARD J. KOENIG COMPANY, 10 South La Salle Street. SPAULDING & CO., Michigan Avenue and Van Buren St.
CINCINNATI:	BENZIGER BROTHERS, 429 Main Street. (Factory in De Kalb Avenue and Rockwell Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.) FR. PUSTET CO., 436 Main Street.
CLEVELAND:	NORTHERN OHIO PLATING WORKS, 1501 Columbus Road.
DENVER:	JAMES CLARKE CHURCH GOODS HOUSE, 1638-40 Tremont St.
LOS ANGELES:	EDWARD J. KOENIG COMPANY, 1107 South Main Street.
MILWAUKEE:	BERGS MANUFACTURING CO., 483-485 Twenty-seventh Street. DIEDERICH-SCHAEFER CO., 413 Broadway. A. WERNER, 649 E. Water Street.
NEW YORK:	BENZIGER BROTHERS, 36-38 Barclay Street. (Factory in De Kalb Avenue and Rockwell Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.) THE FEELEY CO., 10 W. 50th Street. THE GORHAM COMPANY, 5th Avenue and 47th Street. P. J. KENEDY & SONS, 44 Barclay Street. FR. PUSTET CO., 52 Barclay Street. RAMBUSCH DECORATING CO., 2 West 45th Street. THE C. WILDERMANN CO., 33 Barclay Street.
OMAHA:	KOLEY AND SON, 2910 Farnam Street.
PHILADELPHIA:	H. L. KILNER, & CO., 1708 Market Street. J. J. McDERMOTT, Room 818, 1011 Chestnut Street. F. C. PÉQUIGNOT, 1331 Walnut Street. FRANK QUIN & CO., 46 North 9th Street. HERMAN J. WOLF, 539-543 W. Huntingdon Street. WRIGHT MANUFACTURING CO., 127-35 Master Street.
PITTSBURGH:	E. J. LETZKUS, 2006 Jenkins Arcade.
PROVIDENCE:	THE GORHAM COMPANY, Elmwood. W. J. SULLIVAN CO., 96 Jefferson Street. JOSEPH TALLY, 506-512 Westminster Street.
SEATTLE:	THE KAUFER CO., 1607 Fourth Avenue.
ST. LOUIS:	B. HERDER BOOK CO., 17 South Broadway. MUELLER PLATING CO., 920 Pine St., Imperial Bldg.
ST. PAUL:	THE E. M. LOHMANN CO., 385 St. Peter St.

THE
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

EIGHTH SERIES.—VOL. V.—(LXXV).—AUGUST, 1926.—NO. 2.

THE PRIEST'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PSYCHO-ANALYSIS.

Its Theory and Practice.

IN submitting this article to the readers of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW the writer was guided by the thought that, while the study of the subject in question is popular at present and has its value in many respects, particularly for the directors of souls, its importance is largely misconstrued. Hence the desirability, especially for the student of theology and the guide of conscience, to get a clear perspective with full bearing of the new science in its practical effects.

There is scarcely another philosophical term which enjoys in our days such a degree of popularity as the word psychology. The thing, however, which under this name so merrily sails on the billows of popular favor, is not the rational psychology of the Scholastics and their successors; it is not even the younger branch of experimental psychology, which, divorced from all metaphysics, finally landed in a psychology without a psyche. The psychology which has attracted so much attention in our papers, books and reviews recently, is nothing more than the psychology of the Viennese psychiatrist, Dr. Sigmund Freud, whose revolutionary ideas, backed by a powerful propaganda and presented as "the" New Psychology, are disturbing the minds of the unsophisticated and, though in a more philosophical toga, are rapping at the sanctuaries of the thinkers. The time has come when the Catholic priest can no longer avoid the unpleasant task of familiarizing himself with the new thought. The dividing line between truth and error must be drawn; the voice of prudent warning must be heard: other-

wise this new theory and its practical application will endanger the faith and morals of our people.

Originally, the New Psychology was not a new system of thought, but simply the working basis of Psycho-Analysis, a psycho-therapeutic method of treating certain neurotic diseases. It was new because it laid special stress on the purely psychic causes of the neurosis in sharp opposition to the one-sided somatic theories and treatments. Gradually, however, it has spread beyond the narrow field of psycho-therapy and has transformed itself into a psychology of human life in general, its civilization, morality and religion. The New Psychology claims to have grasped the psychical life of man as a whole, as a compact unity, and from this background proposes to explain all psychic phenomena: man's love and desires, his hopes, efforts and failures, his most sublime thoughts, his witticisms and forgetfulness.

It is impossible to give a comprehensive view of the new ideas within the limited scope of this article. It is only the psycho-analytical movement of Freudian orthodoxy whose main features we undertake to examine: the theory of the Unconscious and the Libido, its repression into the unconscious, and the disguising symbolism under which it reappears in consciousness.

The New Psychology divides the human mind into the conscious and the unconscious. The duality of the mind constitutes a cardinal principle in the philosophy of the ablest exponents of modern psychologic thought, though in defining the two minds there seems to be much confusion. Some are inclined to regard the unconscious mind as a distinct entity possessing independent powers and functions, an organization analogous to our conscious mind. The majority, however, satisfies itself by calling the unconscious the mysterious depth of the human mind where there is a working unknown to our consciousness: unconscious ideas, thoughts, volitions, wishes, desires. The unconscious is that region of the mind in which are ideas, desires, conflicts, in a word past experiences, mostly of a sexual nature, which for ethical, esthetical or other reasons have been repressed into oblivion and cannot be restored to consciousness by ordinary means. The unconscious, however, is not only the burial-ground, the storehouse of those past

experiences; it is also a mill, whose wheels are ever turning, a laboratory, where work goes on unceasingly day and night. Experiences cannot be completely banished from our lives. Repressed and driven into oblivion, they continue to live in the unconscious, retaining their full vigor and ever striving to force themselves upon our consciousness. The unconscious is the unsounded depth of the soul, it is our real self, our true personality. What comes from there is truest and most personal. Our best thoughts, clearest ideas, brightest inspirations, finest witticisms are emanations from the deep source of the unconscious.

We have just said that the unconscious is continually at work to force a pathway into the conscious mind. The only road into the coveted sporting-ground of consciousness leads through the narrow gate of the "censorship," a control process, a barrier, whose function it is to watch over and inhibit the manifestations of the primitive psyche, if incompatible with the demands of consciousness. The ever vigilant censor is the handy-man that opens or shuts the flood-gate of the unconscious. But his watchfulness is continually cheated by the tricky unconscious. The primitive instincts and the repressed experiences, called complexes, are leaping through and sporting around in the conscious, partly in their true shape, but generally masked and disguised in symbolical forms. In the latter case, only the trained eye of the expert psychologist will be able to detect their cunning camouflage and recognize them as the mere symbols of the unconscious and of the complex it hides. A complex, therefore, is an unconscious idea, a suppressed experience or constellation of experiences, a jammed-in and strangulated emotion, which exercises a real influence on the mental life of the individual energizing his actions, thoughts, likes and dislikes, while the relation of cause and effect between the forgotten experience and its resonance in the mental life is utterly unknown to the subject. A complex is a psychic trauma, a wound in the soul, a thorn in the foot crippling the walk to nobler heights and making us nervous wrecks or even insane. The idea, the complex, therefore, becomes a real disease, its poisoned fruit being psychoneurosis in its various degrees and shades.

The method of ridding the mind of the baneful influence of the complex is called psycho-analysis or the Freudian method. It differs from that employed by other psychiatrists by discarding the use of suggestion or hypnotism. The hidden complex once drawn from its hiding-place in the unconscious and recalled to the full light of consciousness, the nerve-wrecking experience is re-lived, the jammed-in emotion is set free or "abreacted", and the trouble fades away in a natural fashion. The technical term for this process is Catharsis.

The road leading into the busy workshop of the unconscious is the old association theory. The free play of association as it takes place in an informal conversation, in the most insignificant happenings of everyday life, and especially in dreams, affords a sure clue to the ideas and emotions pent up in the unconscious. The dream, in fact, is the *Via Regia,* the royal highway, to the unconscious and its direct manifestation. In sleep the censorship is almost abrogated, so as to allow the unconscious ideas and wishes to take the field disguised in symbolic forms. The most striking feature of the dream is its symbolic nature, its use of symbolism, a characteristic of the primitive psyche. The symbols of the dream reveal to the mind that knows how to interpret their true meaning, the most direct and the clearest vision of the machinery of the unconscious. Psycho-analysis claims the credit for giving the psychological world a new theory of dreams and their correct interpretation.

A better understanding of the nature of the complex is given by the theory of the instincts, which man has inherited from his savage ancestors and which he harbors like untamed cave-dwellers in his unconscious. There is a difference of opinion among psycho-analysts as to the palm-bearer of the instinct family, but those of orthodox tendencies have cast their vote in favor of the all-powerful and predominating Libido, a primitive brute instinct essentially sexual in character. The libido is the bedrock of man's psyche, root and driving-power of our whole psychical life, motivating both mental and bodily phenomena. If not mastered and sidetracked, if not sublimated and directed into useful channels, the weird energy of libido will spell mental and nervous disorder. The "Œdipus Complex," incestuous love for the parent of the

opposite sex, needs special attention and has to be duly mastered. Œdipus is the king of all the complexes existing in every person, whether normal or abnormal, whether burdened with years or in the prime of happy childhood. Man can never rid himself of the sexual motivation of his actions, but sex energy, when sublimated and working in the service of higher ideals, will become the great driving-power of the most superior cultural achievements. The noblest thoughts, all artistic, social, scientific activity, even religion with its love of God and man, are in the truest sense nothing but sublimated sex energy. This new theory implies, in Nietzsche's phrase, "a transvaluation of values" and must needs bring in its train revolution in our methods of child-training and education. In fact, the New Psychology has in recent years invaded the field of pedagogical science and enshrined Œdipus in the pure soul of the child and infested innocent hearts with the foul germs of psycho-analysis.

Such is the framework of the New Psychology in its most popular form. Psycho-analysis is both a healing method and a theory. As a theory it claims to be the science of the contents of the unconscious and its relation to the conscious mind, while to rational and experimental psychology is left the field of the conscious mind and its activities.

What opinion can be formed of such a system of thought sailing under the captivating name of modern science? It is never fair to reject an idea simply because of its newness. There is a grain of truth in every error; but there are ideas whose exposition is almost identical with their refutation. Common sense and scientific investigation are an impartial tribunal and any theory not resting on the solid foundation of facts and sound reasoning, will finally fail under the acid test of truth, though it be supported by the most powerful propaganda. *Habent sua fata libelli,* and psychological systems, too.

The foundation on which the whole structure of the New Psychology rests, is the doctrine of the duality of the human mind, the splitting of the mind into two separate regions with entirely independent activities. It can be safely said that there is no such thing as the unconscious in the strict meaning of the term: no unconscious memory, wishing, thinking—in

a word, no unconscious processes analogous to those of our conscious mind. Neither the fact nor the necessity of such processes has ever been established by research or by philosophical proof.

It is readily admitted that a true insight into man's complicated psychology must needs take into consideration those past experiences that flit about in the outskirts of our mind, all those psychical imponderabilia of which we are but feebly aware and which, therefore, hardly seem to fall within the realm of consciousness. All those things are only dimly conscious, but they cannot be called either unconscious or subconscious so long as these terms retain their natural meaning. We can, moreover, admit that every deliberate action and every experience leaves an impress in our soul and tends to give a certain inflection to our psychical life, which may influence our subsequent mode of thinking, our likes and actions, though the experience or action itself be completely forgotten. Our ascetic writers quite correctly state that such experiences may exert a deep influence on our psychical life, that both our deeds and misdeeds leave an active legacy in our soul. Psychology has, of course, to account for these well known facts and phenomena, but the philosophical explanation has no need of devising an unconscious with an activity all its own. Such reasoning reminds one of the old Latin grammar rule transferred into the field of philosophy: *Quod declinare non potes, ut neutrum considera*—in our case, what you cannot explain, classify as unconscious. There are in us influences arising from emotional and instinctive sources and from forgotten experiences which affect our conduct, our feelings and our views, though they remain outside our immediate knowledge or conscious control. Those influences, however, do not affect the mind through unconscious processes. Their direct source and adequate cause are psychical dispositions either given to us by nature or induced by our own actions. An individual on hearing the word "complex" will spontaneously think either of the Freudian complex or of the grammatical construction of a sentence. It all depends on the disposition of his mind, which is determined by the fact of his being either a psycho-analyst or a grammatician. A philosopher, on opening a book, will spontaneously and even unconsciously reach up to adjust his

glasses because of a habit, a disposition of his will. Such spontaneous and directly unconscious actions have their psychological explanation in a preëxistent disposition, which together with the mind forms one *principium adaequatum agendi.* The disposition may be immediately and directly unconscious, the same as the mind itself which is modified by it. The act, however, is produced not by means of processes, but of dispositions only. Spontaneous reactions of the mind quite naturally give a true insight into the psyche, not by revealing an unconscious personality, but by laying bare psychical dispositions and mental habits of the individual.

In order to show an unconscious activity of the mind, intellectual memory, the choice-act of the free will and the Scholastic doctrine of the active intellect have been brought into the arena. The choice-act, to be sure, is not unconscious, and the mental act of recalling past memories bears no more analogy to unconscious functions than the working of the *intellectus agens.* The function of the active intellect, it is true, antecedes *prioritate naturae* the act of thinking and is only indirectly and by reasoning known to us. But there is a vast difference between unconscious thinking, which alone is in question, and the function of the active intellect. Although a real cognitive action, the function of the *intellectus agens* is not thinking, but the road to thinking. Thought is the function of the *intellectus possibilis* exclusively. The function of the active intellect, which is to move the thinking intellect to action by means of the *species impressa,* is moreover so intimately connected with the act of thinking that both functions are necessarily linked together and form one complete mental mechanism as long as the union of body and soul exists. Between the mental action of the active intellect and the unconscious mentation of the New Psychology there is no analogy. Any science, it is true, needs good hypotheses on which to work, but any hypothesis not born of a real need and not susceptible of plausible support loses its *raison d'être.* Unconscious activity of the mind as introduced by the New Psychology has no place in scientific psychology, it belongs to the field of fable and fiction.

The supreme court in the new republic of the unconscious is the "censorship", created by the New Psychology, together

with its supreme and only judge, the "censor". Invested with magical power, the censor keeps the crude population of the unconscious from pushing into consciousness except obscurely and under decent disguise. The censor takes care that the dwellers of the unconscious are dressed up in Sunday attire, especially when they come to perform their acrobatic stunts on the stage of the dream. The censor is not only a myth, but a logical gallimathias and nonsense. Censorship involves evidently an act of judging. If censorship be unconscious, we have an eminently rational and at the same time unconscious act. If censorship be conscious, it must be the function of our reason, which is the same as the conscious mind. Whatever ugliness, deformity, repulsiveness the censuring reason sees in the dwellers of the unconscious, is *ipso facto* also the object of our consciousness, and therefore there is nothing to be hidden from the conscious mind, nothing to be disguised or dressed up before admission to consciousness; there is, in a word, nothing to be censured. Conscious cognition and conscious repression with an unconscious object is a contradiction.

It is a highly unpleasant task to examine the unsavory theory of the Libido and its central position in the psychical life of man. The Freudians "analyze" into man an exclusively sexual constitution. The primitive sexual instinct dominates all human activity and libido is identical with the sexual motivation of man. Such a theory, absolutely materialistic in its whole make-up, cannot be called psychology. It is the wildest apriorism, utterly unscientific and arrogantly dogmatic. The sexual instinct, no doubt, is an important factor in the psychical life of every human. Wrongly handled, it may lead to mental and nervous disorders, of whose real cause the patient may be completely unaware. But it is repulsive to both taste and common sense to scent the Œdipus complex in every psychic phenomenon, to regard everything between heaven and earth as a sexual symbol, to explain all human activity from the most common to the most sublime, whether normal or abnormal, as an expression of sex. There are numerous other instincts and constellations of instincts which are just as real and scarcely less influential. To "psychoanalyze" art and religion, science and morality into a brutish

instinct and to do this under the cloak of modern science falls hardly short of a crime against civilization. Libido and Œdipus offer the correct measuring unit of the whole system of the so-called New Psychology.

The psycho-analytic theory with its unconscious and its complexes is avowedly deterministic, and destructive of the liberty of the will and consequently of all morality. In Freud's own words, there is no such thing as psychic liberty. Moral becomes identical with biological, conducive to psychic and bodily health. Liberty is an illusion; we think to push, but we are pushed by, the unconscious. Men are puppets moved in their actions by the strings of an irresponsible unconscious. The real causes of what we do in our acts from hour to hour are hidden from us and the majority of assigned reasons are mere pretexts, the real motives being in the unconscious and therefore absolutely inaccessible to us. From the viewpoint of this New Psychology, civilization is sublimated sexuality, while virtue and purity are apish hypocrisy.

The present review would not be complete without a special inquiry into the nature and practice of the psycho-analytical method, which historically is the parent and logically the offspring of the New Psychology. The following paragraphs deal only with orthodox psycho-analysis as sponsored, practised and popularized by the Freudian school. There is a numerous progeny that retains the name of psycho-analysis, though it decidedly rejects some of the essential elements of the original theory, such as its gross materialism, its determinism, and especially the central position attributed to the sex instinct. Since psycho-analysis is more or less the invention of the Viennese psychiatrist, it would prevent confusion if the child were left in exclusive possession of the name bestowed upon it by its parent.

Psycho-analysis is both a theory and a method. The theoretical feature has been sketched and examined in the foregoing paragraphs. As a method of treating nervous disorders it has a technique of its own that embraces the exploration of the complex, abreaction, transference, and sublimation. Once establish a "sympathetic rapport" between patient and analyst, and the next and most nerve-wrecking work is the exploration of the unconscious and the extraction of the com-

plex from its fox hole. The hidden cause of the neurosis and mental derangement is located by free association, by studying the reaction of the mind during dreams, by direct questioning, by careful observation of the external manifestations of thoughts and emotions. There can, indeed, be no reasonable objection to this procedure, provided the analyst abstains from fantastic interpretation of Freudian symbols thus "analyzing" into the psyche of the patient things that exist only in the mentality of the analyst himself. It is a well-known fact that there is quite frequently a causal connexion between complications and aberrations of the patient's former life and his present disorders. It is, in fact, one of the few merits of psychoanalysis to have dislodged the one-sided somatic therapy formerly in vogue and to have brought into the limelight the biological character of our psychical functions and the important influence which such purely psychic factors exercise upon both the normal and abnormal mental life. The analyst may be reasonably sure of helping his patient and even of curing him if the latter can be induced to grasp the link between his trouble and its cause and at the same time is willing to remove the disturbing influence. This sensible kind of "abreaction" or "catharsis" may be safely admitted as the basis of a final cure, but it would also purify the analytical method itself of the unscientific assumption of a weirdly working unconscious and place it on the solid foundation of scientific psychology.

Another step in the analytical treatment is called transference. The impressions and emotions brought into consciousness are re-lived by the patient not as past ones, but in the form of a current relation to the analyst. Because psychoanalysis is not an intellectual, but essentially an emotional process, the unconscious needs a substitute and the revived emotions must be unloaded on another person, the analyst himself, who now takes the place of the person who had been the real object of these emotions. In other words, the patient, if the transference be positive, falls deeply in love with the analyst. Here is the moral danger-point that cannot be camouflaged by any rightful desire to regain the lost health. Where there is difference in sex and there is an hysterical young woman (most of the Freudian clients belong to this class) being, for an hour a day for at least three months,

analyzed by an analyst, who usually does not come from the ranks of the responsible medical profession and whose imagination and mentality, while bare of any religious support, is filled to overflowing with sexual notions and symbols, there is, indeed, the greatest moral danger. It is a hazard that scarcely can be kept in check by any precautions. We have heard warning voices against this danger, and anyone charged with the moral welfare of our people will do well not to ignore the warning. There is, of course, question of the health and perhaps of the life of the patient or even of saving the sufferer from insanity. This consideration will justify many things. But there is also another question to be considered: the healing value of the analytical treatment. The medical profession has cast a cloud of doubt on the numerous cures reported in psycho-analytical literature. Dr. Emil Raimann, a famous neurologist of Vienna, has little praise for the Freudian method and less praise for Freudian patients and cures. After a careful study of psycho-analysis he arrives at the conclusion that it is of doubtful value and that its practical use cannot be recommended. The same view is held by the American neurologist, Dr. Joseph Collins, after a thorough and extensive test of the Freudian claims in the Neurological Institute of New York. The voices of protest that come from competent professional sources are, in fact, getting louder from day to day and the warning is sometimes expressed in most emphatic terms. In the present case it is, perhaps, not against pastoral prudence to follow the rule we have heard as students: *Experto fide Ruperto.*

Literature bearing on the subject tells us that there is no such brain-wrecking work in any department of medicine as in psycho-analysis. Quite naturally, the unconscious stubbornly objects to having its soiled linen hung out on the clothes-line of consciousness. The battle against its tricky strategy is finally won and the goal of the long treatment reached in the "abreaction" of the complex and in the "sublimation" of the primitive instinct by its employment in the higher channels of creative endeavor. After he has been made to see the link between the emotional background and his mental disorder, the patient is led on to weave the now disentangled threads into a new whole and to understand him-

self better. From this self-knowledge springs hope and confidence and power to adapt himself to a world of reality. There is, indeed, a need of sublimation, but this very need proves the final limitation of psycho-analysis. Real sublimation is the work of education and of religion, not of medical treatments. If there is a particle of truth in psycho-analysis, it throws a new light on some of our Catholic practices. It proves especially the healing power of sacramental confession, which not always has been sufficiently appreciated. Confession induces man, under the guidance of grace, to dig down into his past, analyzing his soul and tracing the disturbing elements which as complexes may be infesting his psychical life. There is genuine abreaction in the purpose of amendment, true catharsis in the regained purity and peace of conscience, and highest sublimation in the sublime ideals placed before him by Christ and the Church. Of another psycho-analysis normal man has no need. The treatment, however, of abnormal mentality must be reserved not to the whims of a psychical analyst, but exclusively to the professional neurologist, whose scientifically trained mind will employ a kind of psycho-analysis which is free from fantastic fictions and whose sterling character will treat the patient with that reverence to which a sufferer gifted with psychic liberty and immortality is entitled.

It may be interesting and temptingly alluring to the taste of some people to view life from a purely sexual angle; psychology and the medical profession may, in time, pick some useful elements out of the foul mire of the psycho-analytical theory and method, but anything appealing chiefly to sensation is of short duration and psycho-analysis as a whole will either ingloriously fade away or find its road back to the solid ground of science and common sense.

CHAS. MENIG

Tipton, Kansas.

WORKS OF REFERENCE.

T. V. Moore, *Dynamic Psychology.*
E. B. Barrett, *The New Psychology.*
J. Lindworsky, *Stimmen der Zeit,* CVIII, 5.
A. Willwoll, *Gregorianum,* VI, 4.
T. J. Hudson, *The Law of Psychic Phenomena.*
O. Pfister, *The Psycho-Analytic Method.*
B. Low, *Psycho-Analysis.*
S. Freud, *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life;—Totem and Taboo.*

PREACHING TO CHILDREN.

EVEN a slight knowledge of the warfare waged by modern pedagogy against traditional methods of catechising might well make the preacher to children hesitate before essaying a somewhat similar task. What is the approved way of presenting important truths to childish minds? Whether trained specially for the uncertain work or not, the priest is often called upon to "say a few words" from the altar to a congregation of children ranging through various ages and educational grades and mental aptitudes, and there are occasions when custom demands that the Bishop shall also address them. I do not envy the casual preacher his unaccustomed task, for I recall having preached thus upon a sudden demand that permitted little or no time for preparation, and I bear to this day a disturbing memory of smiles flitting across the faces of the children and even of the good Sisters, at portions of the address where assuredly I had intended no humor. Whatever humor was achieved was doubtless at my own expense.

Pedagogy has changed many old-time methods. The priest who has been trained in them might hope to find comfort at reading the praise bestowed by the Anglican Bishop of Coventry upon the "Penny Catechism".[1] He prints its text in full[2] in his work, *Pastors and Teachers,* having previously referred to it (page 81) thus: "The Penny Catechism, which is used in the Roman Church in England—a remarkably clear document, with well-constructed questions and answers." He published his book in the year 1902.

In 1910, however, the Rev. Mr. Rivington's work, *How to Teach and Catechise,* was published in London. He devotes more than a page to a hearty denunciation of another Catholic catechism which obviously follows the same methods as the

[1] "A Catechism of Christian Doctrine approved by the Cardinal Archbishop and Bishops of England and Wales." It is commonly called the "Penny Catechism". It was this Penny Catechism, by the way, that Robert Hugh Benson conned when preparing for his reception into the Catholic Church: "In my spare time I studied the Penny Catechism" (*Confessions of a Convert,* p. 130). Meat for strong men, it was hardly milk for babes.

[2] Pages 246-288. An Appendix contains seven catechisms, translated into English wherever necessary: Luther's, Church of England, Heidelberg, The Shorter Catechism, Russian Catechism, Penny Catechism, Catechism of the Free Evangelical Church.

Penny Catechism. He is arguing that the questions should be simple and contain only one question at a time, although it is "common enough to hear him [the catechist] ask the children a complex question". He then begins his fusillade[3] against the catechism:

To give some instances, quoted from a Catechism expressly published for the instruction of "little" children, which has had apparently a large sale, and which is a most appalling witness to the dire need of reform in religious instruction:—Question No. 2: "Why did God make you?" The answer to this question might well occupy three large volumes, and yet not be exhausted. Yet the infant is expected to answer it in one breath. It would occupy certainly more space than can be given here to the discussion of such abject incompetency to enter into a detailed description of its defects.

Now the Penny Catechism asks that very question (No. 2), and gives as answer: "God made me to know Him, love Him, and serve Him in this world, and to be happy with Him for ever in the next." Rivington continues:

Again, Question No. 3: "How are you to know, love, and serve God?" Here are contained, quite clearly, three questions at least, and if we examine these in detail, we find that each of the three is vague and indefinite to the last degree, and would require a volume in reply.

The catechism he is attacking is not, indeed, the Penny Catechism, but obviously follows the same method. He continues:

The whole of this precious Catechism is full of similar monstrosities, as for instance, Question No. 39: "What does the Holy Name of Jesus mean?" Answer: "The Holy Name of Jesus means God the Saviour, and when I say or hear it, I should always bow my head." In this case, not only is the child taught what is incorrect, for the name of Jesus means, "The salvation of Jehovah", but it is actually taught to give a complex answer to a simple question, by introducing something which was not contained in the question at all, thus out-Heroding Herod himself by going beyond the errors of the Catechist. And this Catechism is supposed to be so very good and admirably suited to little children. Poor children!

[3] Rivington, *How to Teach and Catechise,* pp. 172-4, gives the impugned questions.

It might be pointed out here that *in no other subject in our schools* is the system of teaching children to give answers by rote[4] any longer used. It has long ago been condemned by the best educational authorities as entirely inadmissible as a system of teaching.

But the clergy cling to it still, and fondly imagine that they can feed children on fossil food.

We recall the praise given to the Penny Catechism by the Bishop of Coventry, and we feel, in the light of Mr. Rivington's criticism, that we are quite old-fogyish, and must mend our methods considerably. Only one phase of the child's psychology has been treated thus far, but Mr. Rivington discusses many other phases. He is treating catechetical work, but his contentions and illustrations may make a preacher more sensitive to the difficulties involved in preparing sermons for childish minds.

* * *

This paper makes no pretense either of an intent or an ability to discuss the various methods of catechising, and still less does it venture to assess their relative values. It merely wishes to point out that preaching to children has some affinities with teaching children,[5] and to call attention to some difficulties perhaps not suspected by preachers.

If children were able to give a detailed account of the impressions made upon them by a sermon especially addressed to them, we should profit largely thereby and could learn much of the psychology and pedagogics of preaching. The best account of such preaching and its impressions I find at the

[4] The Bishop of Coventry thinks the short catechism should be memorized and will thus offer a framework within which more detailed instruction can be inserted later on. Elsewhere he speaks of "The Shorter Catechism" (Westminster, 1647): "The result was that the Shorter Catechism was committed to memory by every one, and it was rare to find a Scotchman who could not defend a doctrine" (p. 93). In the Preface to a larger Catholic Catechism published by Dolman in London, 1843, we read: "Children indeed, whose minds are as weak as their bodies, and even all beginners, are to learn, as they do the alphabet, those little short Catechisms by heart, although they do not understand them; for it is so much gained" (p. iv). The modern pedagogy is shocked at this rote work, which is no longer used in any other subject taught in the schools, declares Mr. Rivington. It was much in favor once, as I recall my earliest textbook in history, which was a Catechism of U. S. History composed, I think, by Kerney. (Footnote of H. T. H.)

[5] Mark, *The Pedagogics of Preaching*, discusses (pp. 63-92) the chief features in a psychological situation "which are common to teaching and preaching".

end of Bishop Dupanloup's *Entretiens sur le catéchisme* (pp. 553-588 *passim*). It is given by a priest who devoted many years to catechetical work, and who recalls, for the information of a friend, the exercises he himself went through, when preparing for his First Communion at the excellently organized catechisms of Saint-Sulpice in Paris. He was then twelve years and six months old—not, therefore, a young child, but a growing boy, apparently of bright and susceptible nature, and evidently offering excellent soil, as the account shows, for the sowing of the Word. This account is in the highest degree detailed, and the wonder is that his descriptions of the homily and the sermon he listened to are so emotional and general instead of analytic and detailed. His thirty-five large printed pages are a sort of *fervorino* implying that everything in the catechisms was excellent beyond conception. No faults are anywhere found, no difficulties of intelligence suggested, no *lacunae* unfilled.

He heard a homily on the Last Judgment, and recalls simply that the preacher's voice was gentle and that an older lad declared the homily good—an opinion he thinks correct! Again, M. Teysseire, "an angelic priest", who was the annual visitor to the Catechisms of Saint-Sulpice, addressed the class: "From the moment when he appeared in our midst, his countenance and the fire of his look pierced me: he addressed us with a grand and simple eloquence. His word was a living and tender flame; I was rapt by it. There was especially one moment when, speaking of the ingratitude of men toward God, his soul emitted a cry that still remains in the depth of my memory. Up to that time, none of my catechists had so greatly moved me" (p. 568). Finally, the retreat before Communion was "very well" preached by Father de Quelan, who subsequently became Archbishop of Paris: "I still recall the great impression made on us by his sermon on sin and its consequences. Giving an account of the Jewish deicides and of the siege of Jerusalem, he rose to very great heights of eloquence, if I may judge by our emotion; we were all agitated and in tears" (p. 575).

One might gather from this that a sermon or homily to children should be grave rather than jocose or even light in treatment. The preacher is not to offer instruction, for that

is given by the appointed catechists, but is to comment rather on the instructions given, to compliment the catechists in order to gain for them an additional respect, and to deliver an appeal to the emotional nature of the children. The dignity of his office will emphasize such an appeal and cause it to be remembered. Meanwhile, he is to be winning in gentleness, to exhibit no softness of character, to be grave, benign, sincere, following the counsel of Polonius to Laertes, "Be thou familiar, but by no means vulgar."

* * *

The same priest-catechist writes again[6] to his friend to describe his first efforts at giving homiletic instruction. He prepared, with great care, his homily on the Last Judgment, and thought he had made an excellent impression on his pupils, an opinion confirmed by his associated catechists (p. 594), but a month later delivered an instruction on The Four Last Things which his confrères found quite mediocre, "and justly so". "It was not an instruction, but rather four species of homily containing very little instruction." He was much discouraged, but unreasonably so, for a young catechist must not hope for success at his first attempt. He analyzes the reason for his failure, and here we may find points of good counsel. Quite accidentally he came upon some notes of instructions delivered by the most successful of the catechists of Saint-Sulpice. They were a treasure trove.

What pearl of great price had our enthusiastic catechist discovered? From the notes he learned of the possible alliance of the liveliest spirit with the tenderest heart, a most amiable simplicity united with sublimity and depth; he learned a horror of his defects and of what he styles his "rhetoric"; he acquired a taste for the simplicity of truth and of unction in speaking to children. In short, he found the way to the heart and the mind of children.

* * *

There are two more pages of appreciation of M. Teysseire's catechetical powers, in virtue of which one could declare, says our catechist, that the object of his eulogy might be said to lisp, with the children, in a celestial tongue. What a wonderful find that was—the very words, carefully written down,

[6] Dupanloup, *Entretiens sur le catéchisme*, pp. 589-611.

albeit only on scraps of paper, of a man who was the greatest of all the exceptionally well-fitted catechists of Saint-Sulpice! We wonder vaguely why some examples of his addresses to children had not been vouchsafed us instead of such an extended series of eulogies. The pearl of great price would have lost naught of its value through the process of a wide and common ownership. Why not let all catechists, and all preachers to children alike, share in the golden secret?

We have another picture (p. 606) from the same pen, of a discourse delivered to the children by Père Guyon. It lasted two hours, to the discomfiture of all present except—the children! It seems that "his speech was so alive, his action so animated, during these two hours, that the children remained motionless and ceased not for a moment to have their eyes fixed on him and their souls hanging on his words" (p. 607). He continues:

> I recall, amongst others, his sermon on the Last Judgment. I recall the moment when he represented God as addressing a child-sinner at the hour of judgment and saying to him: "Who are you? Whence do you come?"—"Lord, I come from the earth."—"And who placed you on the earth?"—"Lord, it was you."—"And why did I place you on the earth?"—"Lord, it was to know you, to love you, to serve you, and thus to obtain eternal life." [One is tempted to interrupt the dialogue at this point, to recall Mr. Rivington's comment on this complex question. As represented by the good Père Guyon, the Lord was an inexpert catechist, whilst the child-sinner could at least plead that he had memorized his catechism quite satisfactorily, although, as the event will show, without sufficient fruit of reaction upon the child's will.] "Well, then, let us see. Have you known me, have you loved me, have you served me?"—Then began an examination, most detailed and convincing, which achieved this terrible conclusion: "You have not known me, you have not loved me, you have not served me? You shall not have eternal life!" . . .
>
> I recall two other sermons of his, one of them on death, In this, rising to the highest considerations, he knew how to make them accessible to the intelligences of the children; in particular this thought: "That death reigned in the world and was its veritable sovereign."
>
> "This house, you say, is mine; no, it belongs to death; after a short time, death will chase you out of it and give it to another", etc.

From these brief extracts, we can learn that dialogue is interesting to children. It is dramatic, and if phrased in simple and direct language, is intelligible. It may well alternate with anecdote[7] and be equally interesting. Our catechist, indeed, furnishes us with an anecdote at this point:

Some time after the Retreat and the First Communion, having conducted some of our children on an excursion to Issy, I was walking with them in the higher part of the park, under the trees of the walk called the *Quarantaine*. You know that one can see thence a superb horizon and can also catch, with a single glance, Paris in all its amplitude. Whilst the dear children were heartily enjoying themselves, I suddenly became aware that one of them was thoughtful as he looked at the great spectacle we had under our eyes. I said to him: "Jules, what are you thinking about?"—"I was thinking, he replied, that, as the preacher of the Retreat told us, *all of this belongs to death.*"

A final lesson we may learn from our catechist is that once we have a real love for children we shall find it easy to preach to them. He had to address the same children, preparing now for Confirmation:

I was appointed to preach the short sermon that day. I did so with an ease that astonished myself, as I had never found the labor easy; but my mind and heart were so filled with these dear children and with the happiness of their First Communion that all gushed out of the deeps of my soul. I then recalled what M. Borderies had said to me: "You will perceive how you will speak to them without any trouble, when you have loved them." The truth is that, even for sterile minds, love of souls is the grand inspiration. I felt it thoroughly on that day. Amongst other things I told them a story that

[7] Eichbaum, in his volume entitled *The Preacher's Scrapbook*, gives us an anecdote with similar moral (No. 95): "A rich man built a palace in which all was arranged and furnished with great magnificence; when the building was completed, he took possession, hoping to spend many years in it. All who saw the palace expressed admiration. One day he showed it to a hermit, hoping that he too might compliment him on his good fortune. In answer to the demand of the rich man, the hermit answered: 'This dwelling is truly well ordered in all respects except that there is a door too many, and you ought to wall it up.' On being asked what door he meant, he replied: 'It is the one by which your corpse will pass out; for as long as you leave it open, it is impossible that your happiness can last eternally, and that which does not last eternally is not happiness.'" But one wonders if any well-constructed anecdote on death could be considered equally vivid, searching, and powerful, with that of our Lord about the rich man who bade his soul to be merry, concluding with: "Thou fool, this night will they require thy soul of thee".

I owe to the notes of M. Teysseire, and I came to the last words of the tale: "It was a Thursday, my dear children", all my auditory trembled, and their eyes were wet with tears.

The sermon was on a Sunday preceding the day of Confirmation, which was set for the following Thursday. The allusion is thus intelligible—but how we miss the story itself! Why could he not have recounted that for us as well as for his dear children?

* * *

Instead of a scholastic dissertation on the pedagogics of preaching to children, let me simply set down some suggestions with accompanying illustration. The trained and experienced teacher could multiply humorous examples.

1.—The priest may share with the untrained teacher a misapprehension as to the extent and the character of a child's vocabulary. I once heard a young priest addressing a large congregation of children: "Remember, my dear children", he said, "that God is omniscient, omnipresent, and omnipotent." It would not be easy for them to remember that! The suggestion is obvious: Use simple words. The preacher might have said equally well: "Remember, my dear children, that God knows everything, that he is everywhere, and that he can do anything."

2.—We become so accustomed to set phrases that we lose sight at length of their cumbrous verbiage. Jacotot's paradox would help us here, but unfortunately the preacher is farther removed than a mere week or two from the intellectual limitations of childhood. We have long forgotten, if we ever remembered, our own childish puzzlement over certain words, phrases, signs and problems of the class-room. How often did it occur to us then, or did we venture, to seek enlightenment from teacher or preacher? The suggestion is: Simplify phrases. Rivington gives us a comical anecdote. A parson was asked by his own child the meaning of "Endue Thy Ministers with Righteousness." He explained that the sentence meant, "Make them good." *"Then why don't you say so?"* replied the child. The child who would speak to a preacher in such a fashion is indeed a rare exception. I am inclined to think that most children would not even puzzle

over the sentence, but would immediately let it join the innumerable caravan of similar sentences that fly in flocks far, far above a child's head.

3.—Children easily confuse words that have a similar sound. I once heard a teacher making merry over a child who had carried into the "language" lesson a reminiscence of the lesson in physiology, and began to speak about the "vowels of the human body".

4.—Children may attach only one meaning to a word that has more than one. The preacher is so familiar with both the literal and the figurative meaning that he will not pause to consider the plight of a child. Rivington gives us an example:

> A teacher had told her children that the Israelites were a great body of people, and then proceeded to ask what there always was in the body of God's people. It would be difficult for anyone to guess what the desired answer to such a vaguely worded question might be. Possibly the teacher had the idea of God's presence in her mind. But the answer she received was a startling one: "The stomach!" The child had, of course, only one idea of the word "body", and the teacher had never learnt even the probability of this. Because the word "body" in the sense she used it was perfectly simple and familiar to herself she took it for granted that the child was equally well acquainted with its figurative use and meaning.

Desiring to avoid the long word "assemblage" in defining the Church, a preacher might easily substitute the word "body" of all the faithful. We are left to conjecture what thought is carried away from the sermon, the more so as the Church is mystically referred to as that body of which Christ is the Head. The literal, figurative and mystical meanings may get sadly jumbled in a youngster's mind.

5.—Children, again, may attach only a slangy meaning to words that appear to be perfectly simple to a preacher. I am reminded here of an "example" in one of the tracts prepared by Father Furniss, C.SS.R.,[8] for the use of children. What idea will come to the city child's mind when he hears of a "kid" and a "monk"? The anecdote runs:

[8] Furniss, *Tracts for Spiritual Reading* (New York, 1890). The example occurs as No. XXXVIII in the tract entitled, "God Loves Little Children".

An old man one day came to the great church of Montserrat in Spain. He brought with him his little boy and a kid. He wanted to offer them to God. An ignorant man who was standing at the door said: "We will take the kid, but we do not want the little boy." The Abbot heard of this; he was very angry with the man who had sent away the little boy. So he sent somebody after the old man to tell him that the little boy might come back. The Abbot was very kind to him, and put him to school. When the little boy was nine years old, he began to wear the same dress as the monks. He was very good, and afterwards he became Abbot and built a new church. All this account about him may be read on his grave-stone.

The words in this example are simple and short. But "kid" and "monk" have their slangy interpretations, whilst "Abbot" may convey no meaning whatsoever to a child's mind. A teacher has an advantage here over a preacher, and can familiarly impart the correct meaning of ambiguous words and the meaning of unfamiliar ones. The preacher can hardly enter into such explanations save at the expense of time in a necessarily brief discourse. Looking into the bright eyes of the children and at their motionless posture and intent gaze, he may easily be misled into thinking that he is both intelligible and interesting to his little auditory. Meanwhile, perhaps not an idea crosses their minds as to the real meaning, or importance, or application of his discourse. I recall that when I was a boy of fifteen years, Brother Azarias addressed our class at college. If he happened to see my face, he doubtless felt comforted by the intentness of my gaze. I remember, nevertheless, that I could make nothing of his address at the time, and all I have ever been able to recall of it was the word "organization".

6.—Another suggestion might be: Have no relative clauses, but make the sentences direct and without suspension. Here is a complicated sentence:

> When Antony had resolved neither to go forth himself nor to receive any one, Martinian, a captain in the army, brought his daughter, who was possessed of a devil.

It is the opening sentence of anecdote No. 92 in Eichbaum's volume, intended for teachers as well as preachers. Apart from the sudden introduction of (Saint) Anthony, and the

equally sudden presentation of Martinian, we have the suspension created by "when" and the relative clause introduced by "who". Too many thoughts are crammed into one sentence. The opposite style is well exemplified by the short and direct sentences found in example No. 97:

> Albert, a poor student, passed the night in a mill. A bench in a room on the ground floor served him for a bed. Awaking about midnight, he heard a slight noise near the window. Having looked in that direction he saw by moonlight a silver watch.

The story is too long to be given here. The last two of the quoted sentences could be simplified by removing the suspensions. On the other hand, all four of the sentences could be put into one, with resulting confusion to the minds of children. Consider the long suspension in another anecdote given by Shaw in *The Preacher's Promptuary of Anecdote* (No. 7). The anecdote begins thus:

> During the sunshine of his prosperity, when he was carrying everything before him, when princes, kings, and emperors courted his favor, hung upon his lips, and basked in his smile, when senates and nations trembled at his nod, and carefully noted his every deed and word and look to gather therefrom his future policy, and when, in short, he was at the zenith of his power and fame and glory, the Emperor Napoleon I thought but little of God, lived only for himself, and was negligent of his religious duties.

There is only one word of caution for the preacher who has acquired such a style. The word is, "Don't."

An exhaustive series of similar "Don'ts", or a comprehensive presentation of the Rule of Positives governing addresses to children, cannot be squeezed into an already overburdened paper. Perhaps, in due season, a *catalogue raisonné* of defects and counsels may be drawn up for kindly consideration by those who must preach to children.

H. T. HENRY

Washington, D. C.

ARE PROTESTANT BAPTISMS ORDINARILY VALID?

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW[1] recently had an article by Rev. Joseph P. Donovan, C.M., J.C.D., entitled: "Are Protestant Baptisms Ordinarily Valid?" The author therein examined the baptisms conferred by ministers of leading Protestant sects in the light of the principles which Leo XIII laid down in his Apostolic Letter, *"Apostolicae curae"*, of 13 September, 1896,[2] and which, the Pope states, must be the norms for determining the sufficiency or defect of the intention necessary for the valid administration of a sacrament. The above-mentioned article contends, on the strength of those principles, that there are "presumptively speaking, no valid Protestant baptisms". In view of the fact that several documents which have emanated from the Holy See declare that the presumption is not against but in favor of the validity of baptism conferred in heretical sects, it is worth while examining whether the contention set up in that article is satisfactorily proved.

It is to be noted that Pope Leo in his Apostolic Letter does not deduce the invalidity of Anglican Orders from the false tenets of the Anglicans who rejected the Sacrifice of the Mass and consistently denied to priests all power of "consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord". The Pontiff bases his decision first upon the defect of form. In order to reconcile their practice with their faith the Anglicans replaced the Catholic Pontifical with an ordinal in which there "has been deliberately removed [from the rite of ordination] whatever in the Catholic rite clearly designates the dignity and office of the priesthood"; similarly the rite of consecration to the episcopate had been tampered with, so that, "being vitiated in its origin, it [the Anglican Ordinal] was wholly insufficient to confer Orders".

After very fully developing this proof, which of itself is sufficient to establish the invalidity of Anglican Orders, the Pope continues:

[1] February, 1926, pp. 158-180.

[2] *Codicis Iuris Canonici Fontes cura Emi Petri Card. Gasparri editi* (Romae, 1925), n. 631, vol. III, pp. 494-502. The English translation is based upon S. M. Brandi, S.J., *A Last Word on Anglican Ordinations, . . . with . . . Notes by the Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S.J.* (New York, 1897).

With this inherent *defect of form* is joined the *defect of intention,* which the Sacrament demands with equal necessity that it may exist. The Church does not judge about the mind and intention in so far as it is something by its nature internal, but in so far as it is manifested externally she is bound to judge concerning it. When anyone, etc.[3]

After having propounded his principles, the Pope does not here expressly develop his argument and conclusion of a defect of intention; for he had already pointed out the facts and stated his conclusion, which can be formulated thus:

The vitiation of the form was not due to an oversight or to a misunderstanding, but was introduced deliberately and on set purpose to establish "the necessary connexion between faith and practice, between the law of believing and the law of praying": the definite purpose of the changed rite was to institute a ministry essentially different from the Catholic priesthood and episcopate. Therein lies and from that is proved the *defectus intentionis.*

The correct principles by which to judge the adequacy or defect of intention in the minister of a sacrament are stated very clearly and precisely by Leo XIII in § 10 of his Apostolic Letter. They are quoted on page 159, but not exactly. Through an oversight probably due to an inaccurate translation which may have been used the word "*intendisse*" is omitted from the third line of the quotation which ought to read: "... considered by that very fact *to have intended* to do what the Church does."

Now to discover whether the Apostolic Letter "*Apostolicae curae*" bears out the conclusion drawn in the article let us first see how its principles are enunciated. In the first place it is hardly precise to say:

... We have ... the all-important principle of presumption laid down by Leo XIII in his encyclical on Anglican orders. That principle is that the *systematic attempt to give the form of a sacrament a meaning essentially at variance with the Church's sense* is taken as proof of a wrong intention.[4]

[3] As quoted by Dr. Donovan, p. 159, except the word "*intendisse*", to the omission of which we refer later.

[4] P. 159. Italics mine.

A form of a sacrament may be given "a *meaning* essentially at variance with the Church's sense" in two ways: either the words of the Catholic form are retained, but a construction "at variance with the Church's sense" is put upon them; or the words of the Catholic form themselves are altered so that the new wording no longer signifies what the words of the Catholic form mean.

If "the systematic attempt to give the form of a sacrament a meaning essentially at variance with the Church's sense" is made by altering the words of the form, there is verified the condition which Leo XIII lays down for presuming that "not only is the necessary intention wanting to the Sacrament, but that the intention is adverse to and destructive of the Sacrament".

But if "the systematic attempt to give the form of a sacrament a meaning essentially at variance with the Church's sense" consists in putting a construction "at variance with the Church's sense" upon the unchanged words of the Catholic form, then the Pope's same principle does not warrant the presumption of an adverse or even insufficient intention; for he demands in unmistakable terms that that presumption holds only "if the *rite* is changed with the manifest intention of introducing another rite not approved by the Church, and of rejecting what the Church does and what by the institution of Christ belongs to the nature of the sacrament."[5]

It might be objected that by an essentially wrong construction put upon the correct words of the form "the rite is changed" and the same insufficient and adverse intention is revealed, and that therefore the presumption against the validity of the sacrament is justified. The answer to this objection is found in the second sentence of the quotation from the Pope's Apostolic Letter, page 159: there the opposite presumption of a *sufficient* intention is expressly pronounced: "provided the Catholic rite is employed". The false construction placed upon the otherwise correct wording of the Catholic form can only constitute an argument that in a particular case the presumption in favor of a sufficient intention does not hold.[6]

[5] P. 159. Italics mine.

[6] Cf. S. C. S. Off., Instr. (ad P. Custodem Terrae S.), 30 Jan., 1833.—*Coll. S. C. P. F.*, n. 830.

It is the looseness of phrase in which the article expresses its principle that is fatal to its use. In the words from the Apostolic Letter quoted on page 159 the Pope distinguishes between one intention of a heretical or even unbaptized minister of a sacrament which presumptively does not invalidate the sacrament and another intention which renders the sacrament presumptively invalid. The Pope bases his distinction, not upon "the systematic attempt to give the [correct] form of a sacrament a meaning essentially at variance with the Church's sense," but upon the use of the *correct* form and matter on the one hand and of a *change of the form for the deliberate purpose of effecting that impious "systematic attempt"*. It is one thing to distinguish because of "the systematic attempt to give the [correct] form of a sacrament a meaning essentially at variance with the Church's sense" and quite another to distinguish "if the *rite is changed with the manifest intention* of introducing another rite not approved by the Church and of rejecting what the Church does, and what by the institution of Christ belongs to the nature of a sacrament."[7]

It is indeed to the principles of Leo XIII that the article appeals to prove its contention, but, when applying them to the baptisms conferred in the various sects examined, it does not (except perhaps in the case of Baptist baptism) employ them in the sense that Leo XIII expressed them in his Apostolic Letter, as will be shown in the latter part of this reply.

After quoting the words of Leo XIII in which that illustrious Pontiff enunciated his principles with exceeding preciseness, the article proceeds to its second principle in which the first which applies alike to all sacraments is adapted to baptism in particular:

> If, for instance, a given sect is found uniform in its view of baptism and that view is clearly incompatible with valid baptism, then we immediately have that kind of tampering with the form of a sacrament which Pope Leo tells us is enough for a presumptively invalid intention.

What is meant by the words "and that view is clearly incompatible with valid baptism"? Do they mean that the

[7] § 10, quoted on p. 159. Italics mine.

heretical view of the minister *eo ipso* renders him incapable of conferring valid baptism? Put into this form that phrase is too clearly in conflict with Catholic dogma,[8] to have been intended in such a sense, even though this be the first that obtrudes itself upon the reader: these words must manifestly mean a view incompatible with the *Catholic teaching* concerning baptism.

However, the conclusion that "then we immediately have . . . tampering with the form of a sacrament . . . " goes alarmingly far beyond the premises. For even though a sect depart ever so far from the Catholic doctrine concerning the sacraments in general and baptism in particular, its heretical teaching does not necessarily imply any tampering with the form of a sacrament.

If "tampering with the form" means putting a false construction upon the otherwise correct words of the Catholic form, then what was said above about the "systematic attempt to give the form of a sacrament a meaning essentially at variance with the Church's sense" applies here also: the heretical view of the minister does not *eo ipso* imply or cause a wrong meaning to be attached to or intended by the correct words of the Catholic form, as used by that minister. As said before, this contention will be proven later.

On the other hand by "tampering with the form" cannot be meant that, as soon as it is established that a uniform heretical view concerning baptism is held by a sect, it is immediately proved that that sect has changed the very words of the correct form; in the latter part of the article it is admitted that at least some sects did not substantially change the wording of the form prescribed in the Catholic rite of baptism.

But is it true that "Pope Leo tells us" that, given a uniform view of some sect which "is clearly incompatible with [the Catholic doctrine concerning] valid baptism," "we immediately have that kind of tampering with the form of a sacrament which . . . is enough for a presumptively invalid intention"? In the entire papal document there is not a word that can be construed to mean that manifest heresy regarding sacraments

[8] "Si quis dixerit, baptismum, qui etiam datur ab haereticis in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti cum intentione faciendi quod facit ecclesia, non esse verum baptismum: anathema sit."—Conc. Trid., sess. VII, *de baptismo,* can. 4.

in general or Orders in particular (or by implication regarding baptism) proves *eo ipso* any "tampering" whatsoever "with the form of a sacrament." On the contrary the first two sentences of the quotation from the Pope's Apostolic Letter that appears on page 159 reads:

> When anyone has rightly and seriously made use of the due form and the matter requisite for effecting and conferring a sacrament, he is considered by that very fact *to have intended* to do what the Church does. On this principle rests the doctrine which holds that even that is truly a sacrament which is conferred by the ministry of one who is heretic or unbaptized, provided the Catholic rite is employed.[9]

Far from admitting that even manifest heresy regarding the sacraments proves a "tampering with the form of a sacrament," the Pope clearly presupposes that notwithstanding such heresy the correct form or words of the rite can be and sometimes is employed by non-Catholics; that those words can be and sometimes are used by them in the correct sense; and that speaking in general those words are considered to be used by non-Catholics in the sense in which the Church uses them.

It is contended and will be proved immediately that, as applied to the baptisms of the various sects examined in the second and greater part of the article, pages 160-179, (except perhaps in the case of one which will be pointed out in its proper place), the principle enunciated in that article does not faithfully reflect that of Leo XIII, upon whose authority it intended to base it, but that it can and must be understood in some such sense as the following:

> If it is proved that a sect uniformly hold a view incompatible with the Catholic doctrine concerning baptism, this heretical view is sufficent warrant for interpreting the meaning in which its ministers intend to use the form (even though this form does not substantially differ from that of the Catholic rite), and that consequently there is presumption against the validity of its baptisms.

For despite the avowed purpose of judging the baptisms of the several sects in the light of Pope Leo XIII's "*Apostolicae*

[9] This translation renders the very emphatic statement of the original text more correctly than that found on page 159. Italics mine.

curae" the attempt is made to prove what may be reduced to the following conclusions:

(a) that the sects examined all hold views regarding baptism more or less at variance with Catholic doctrine;

(b) that, even though some sects prescribe a rite of baptism whose words are identical with those in the Catholic form, they by their heresy give "the form . . . a meaning essentially at variance with the Church's sense";[10]

(c) and that that same heresy by corrupting the *meaning* of the otherwise correct form "is taken as proof of a wrong intention".[11]

To show that the second and third of these conclusions are beyond the principles laid down by Pope Leo XIII in his Apostolic Letter *"Apostolicae curae"*, it will be necessary to examine how the principle enunciated in the first pages of the article in the February issue is applied to the baptisms of the several sects.

On pages 160-179 the baptisms of seven sects are examined in the light of the principles of Leo XIII as presented on pages 159-160. This examination begins with Baptist baptism.

> An extended going into that one kind of Protestant baptism will prepare the way for succinct treatment of Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregationalist, Campbellite, Evangelical, Lutheran and Episcopalian baptisms.

This course is, however, not secure against objection. The most space and proportionately greatest attention is devoted to that sect which is furthest removed from the Catholic Church both in creed and practice and the observations regarding its baptism "prepare the way for succinct treatment" of those denominations which are admittedly less removed from the Catholic Church in creed and practice. A more logical order would have treated the respective sects in the inverse proportion and, having proved the point regarding those less removed from the Catholic Church in creed and practice, the "succinct treatment" of the baptism administered in the sects further

[10] Cf: "So do the heretical notions of the Baptists on baptism naturally enter into the literal form, 'I baptize thee etc.' to vitiate it".—P. 167.

[11] Cf. what follows the words quoted in the previous note.

removed might have been justified in as far as it were established that the latter departed even further from Catholic faith and practice in the same direction.

It will suffice here to refute in particular the arguments advanced in the February issue to establish a presumption of invalidity against Baptist baptism. For (excepting one point) the arguments against the validity of baptism conferred in the sects examined later are all of the same nature, but become successively weaker. Once the conclusion regarding Baptist baptism is refuted, the rest fall with it.

Baptist Baptism (pages 160-167). Of all the baptisms examined in the article this one and probably this one alone might be considered presumptively invalid on the strength of Pope Leo's principle. I assume without question that the testimony presented is in every sense reliable.

The case presented in proof of the contention that the view concerning baptism held by Baptists is incompatible with Catholic doctrine is followed by two slightly different forms of the Baptist rite for baptism. Both include the correct wording of the Catholic rite; but to this wording is prefixed an introduction which in the one form reads:

"Because of your testimony that you accept Jesus Christ as your Saviour, I baptize you" etc.

In the other it reads:

"Therefore, in testimony of the re-birth that your faith has already brought you, I baptize you" etc.

The introduction in the first of these forms in itself contains nothing against faith and it is only by reference to the Baptist creed that it takes any semblance of a false intention. What will be said immediately against the presumption of an insufficient intention based on the introduction to the second form tells more forcibly against the presumption based on the introduction to the first form.

The introductory phrase to the second of these forms presents some reason that might favor a presumption against the validity of Baptist baptisms conferred by use of it. For the Catholic form, though itself fully reproduced, might seem to undergo some change, when it is preceded by such a phrase—

a change which might come under the heading of a rite changed with the definite purpose of impressing upon that form a meaning entirely different from the sense that the Church intends by the Catholic form: therefore there might appear to be justification for a presumption against the validity of such baptisms. Nevertheless even that cannot at this stage be admitted. For against that presumption there can be opposed a decision of the Holy Office of 18 December, 1872, which declares that, notwithstanding an express statement made by the minister before baptizing that baptism has no effect upon the soul—still the baptism is not to be considered doubtful: "because, notwithstanding an error regarding the effects of baptism, there is not excluded the intention to do what the Church does".[12]

If that statement made, as can be seen from the second question answered in the same reply, immediately before conferring baptism is not sufficient to warrant a presumption even of doubt against the validity of the baptisms in question, then the prefix to the correct form in the Baptist rite is, to say the least, not certainly sufficient to destroy the presumption in favor of Baptist baptism. For surely the declaration of the minister that baptism produces no effect upon the soul is stronger than the prelude in the second Baptist form.

On pages 166 and 167 the investigation of Baptist baptism is concluded with an appeal to the answer (contained, it appears, in § 10) which Leo XIII made to two claims raised by Anglicans to uphold the validity of their Orders. At first sight some phrases in § 10 seem to convey the impression as though the Pope granted what Dr. Donovan maintains, viz., that the erroneous views of Anglicans concerning Holy Orders directly gave the Anglican form of ordination and consecration its meaning. However, when taken in their context, these phrases are manifestly not intended by the Pope in that sense.

For first of all it is not true that Leo XIII admitted that "the words that accompanied the laying-on of hands in that [Edwardine] ordinal would have been sufficient . . . if used

[12] Quoted in S. C. S. Off., Instr., 24 Jan., 1877, ad 1—*S. C. P. F. Coll.* (2. ed., Romae, 1907), n. 1465, vol. II, p. 100, col. A.—For further development of this point see later paper.

in a Catholic ordinal". In three passages of his Apostolic Letter the Pope had occasion for that admission, if he would have made it: yet in not one of them is it made. In all three passages there is only an hypothetical concession of the form's adequacy for the sake of argument without further examination of its sufficiency.[13]

In § 10 there occur two phrases which appear to be the ones that form the basis for the claim made on pages 166-167. Speaking of the endeavor of some Anglicans to interpret the Anglican form of ordination in a manner not at variance with the Catholic rite the Pope says of the ambiguous words of that form that "they cannot be taken in the same sense as they have in the Catholic rite" (*ea tamen sumere sensum eumdem nequeunt quem habent in ritu catholico*). And a few lines further on the Pope calls the addition to the form made in the revised Ordinal words "which remain words without the thing which Christ instituted" (*quae restant nomina sine re quam instituit Christus*). Wrested from their context these words do in fact appear as weighty arguments in support of the claim made on pages 166-167. But, when they are considered in connexion, not only with the entire papal document, but especially with the remainder of § 10, they are seen to be meant in an altogether different sense. It is not the heretical views as such held by Anglicans concerning Orders that gave the perhaps ambiguous and possibly sufficient form of the revised Anglican Ordinal its insufficient and adverse meaning, but it is the setting in which that form is placed in that Ordinal that determines the sense in which those words must be understood.

The key to the meaning of those phrases is found in the clauses immediately preceding the last of those phrases.

> For once the rite has been changed (*semel novato ritu*), as we have seen, in which the Sacrament of Orders is denied and adulterated and from which every notion of consecration and sacrifice has been rejected (*repudiata*), the formula, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, no longer holds good, because the Spirit is infused into the soul with

[13] "Eadem vero adiectio, *si forte quidem* legitimam significationem apponere formae posset, . . ."—§ 8. ". . . *si qua quidem* verba, in Ordinali anglicano, ut nunc est, *porrigant se in ambiguum*. . . ." ". . . . *etiamsi forte* haberi ea *posset* tamquam sufficiens in ritu aliquo catholico quem Ecclesia *probasset*."—§ 10.

the grace of the Sacrament; and the words, *for the office and work of a priest* or *a bishop,* and the like, no longer hold good, but remain words without the thing which Christ instituted.

In § 10 the Pope points out that "being fully aware of the necessary connexion between faith and practice, between *the law of believing and the law of praying,* under a pretext of reëstablishing the primitive form, they [the Anglicans] corrupted in many ways the liturgical order to suit the errors of the reformers". The expanded form in the Anglican Ordinal is not that one prescribed by the Catholic Pontifical. It may be ambiguous so that it could possibly be understood in the same sense as the Catholic rite. What then determines the sense in which it is meant in the Anglican Ordinal? The article in the February issue supposes it to be the Anglicans' erroneous views concerning Orders that enter into those words whereby their meaning is corrupted and the form vitiated. But Pope Leo traces their meaning back to the new rite in which the sacrament of Orders is denied or adulterated and from which every idea of consecration and sacrifice has been excluded. Even the expanded form suffers from this exclusion of everything that reminds of consecration and sacrifice, so that in the Anglican Ordinal its meaning is totally different from that of the form in the Catholic rite. The Pope confirms this charge by referring to the convictions of the majority of Anglicans on this point.

In the same manner the Pope disposes of the claim for the correct interpretation of the prayer "*Omnipotens Deus bonorum omnium largitor*". Even supposing that it could be sufficient, it lacks the meaning of the Catholic rite. Again this lack of the correct meaning is determined by the change wrought in the rite, that destroyed the correct meaning of the proper form, "since it [the prayer "*Omnipotens Deus bonorum omnium largitor*"] has been stripped of the words which denote the High Priesthood" of the Episcopate, as the Pope declared in § 9.

When therefore the words, upon which the claim made on pages 166-167 is presumably based, are viewed in the light of the entire § 10, it becomes manifest that Leo XIII did not deduce the insufficient meaning of the expanded form of ordination and consecration in the Anglican Ordinal immediately

and directly from the erroneous views concerning the Sacrament of Orders held by Anglicans, but from the change in the rite to which they were prompted by their views.

But even if it were granted that the interpretation of those phrases in § 10, adopted on pages 166-167, is correct and that the errors of Anglicans concerning the Sacrament of Orders naturally enter into the form of ordination and consecration in their Ordinal and determine the meaning in which it must be understood, this conclusion could not be applied to baptism conferred by Baptists and other heretics who, while holding heretical views concerning baptism, employ the correct form. For the comparison is faulty, not merely in some minor detail, but in an essential point. The Baptists have taken over the Catholic form of baptism, or, as they would express it, they have adopted and employ the form instituted by Christ. What more natural than to conclude, then, that in spite of their errors concerning baptism they carry out in baptizing what Christ ordained? This is the very reason with which the Holy Office explained its declaration that Methodist baptism must not be considered doubtful, "because, notwithstanding the error regarding the effects of baptism, there is not excluded the intention to do what the Church does".[14]

On the other hand the Anglican Ordinal does not adopt the Catholic form of ordination and consecration, but has devised an entirely new one. Although this form may perhaps be equivalent to the Catholic form and might suffice in an approved Catholic rite, it is at best ambiguous. Its meaning must naturally be sought in the views of those who composed it. And what those views were and are, can legitimately be discovered in the "native character or spirit" of the Anglican Ordinal, whose authors deliberately and studiously excluded from it every "clear mention of sacrifice, of consecration, of the priesthood, and of the power of consecrating and offering sacrifice". While therefore the heretical view concerning Orders held by Anglicans impresses itself upon the form of ordination and consecration they have invented, the same is not true of the heretical views concerning baptism held by Baptists, who have adopted and employ the form instituted by

[14] Dec. 18, 1872, quoted in the Holy Office's Instructions of 24 Jan., 1877, ad 1—*Coll. S. C. P. F.*, n. 1465.

Christ and thereby naturally reveal their intention of doing what Christ instituted.

From this examination of the "*Apostolicae curae*" it is manifest that this document cannot be invoked as proof for the contention made in the February issue. Far from granting that heretical views concerning the sacraments held by Protestants naturally enter the form of the sacraments and *eo ipso* "essentially corrupt the form . . . by giving it a meaning other than that of Christ and His Church" and that "this suffices . . . to make the intention defective," Pope Leo insists without further restriction that, "when anyone has rightly and seriously made use of the matter and form requisite for effecting and conferring a sacrament, he is by that very fact considered to have *intended* to do what the Church does." Pope Leo admits a defective intention in a non-Catholic rite only "if the rite be *changed* with the manifest intention of introducing another rite not approved by the Church, and of rejecting what the Church does and what by the institution of Christ belongs to the nature of the Sacrament." That was just the reason Pope Leo assigned for declaring a defect of intention in the form of ordination and consecration in the Anglican Ordinal. For, as it was pointed out above, it was not the heretical tenets of the Anglicans as such that vitiated the form of ordination and consecration, but that, as the Pope says in § 10, "they corrupted in many ways the liturgical order to suit the errors of the reformers." The very fact that Anglicans changed the form of ordination and consecration is warrant for the Pope to deduce the meaning and the intention of the form from their errors which prompted the change.

Therefore it is not true that "the heretical notions of Baptists on baptism naturally enter into the literal form, 'I baptize thee etc.' to vitiate it; because the Baptist in baptizing is acting as a principal and carries out his own view." Not only does this conclusion lack all support in the "*Apostolicae curae*", but it is flagrantly in conflict with several decisions of the Holy See. It suffices to refer to the reply quoted above[15] and the others which will be studied below.[16]

[15] P. 144.

[16] See later paper.

All the proof that Baptists hold views incompatible with Catholic teaching concerning baptism (provided that in administering the Sacrament they do not depart essentially from the Catholic rite) brings one no nearer to the presumption that their baptisms are invalid on account of defect of intention. To base such a conclusion on Pope Leo's "*Apostolicae curae*" would make that illustrious Pontiff contradict himself, since his own words in the first two sentences quoted by Dr. Donovan on page 159 enunciate the principle that, given the due form and matter employed even by a heretical minister, the Sacrament conferred by the latter must be considered valid and is so considered by the Church.

Baptisms of the other sects, pages 167-179. In the examination of baptisms conferred in other sects the arguments presented as proof of their presumptive invalidity or doubtfulness do not differ from those adduced against the validity of Baptist baptism (excluding that based on the prologue to the form of the latter) except that, if anything, they become progressively weaker. Therefore what has been proved in the preceding pages, viz., that in the article under review the principles of Leo XIII for distinguishing an inadequate intention in a non-Catholic minister of a sacrament from an adequate one are neither correctly interpreted nor properly employed in examining baptisms conferred by Baptists, applies with even greater force to its later conclusions. Since it has not established a presumption against the validity of Baptist baptism, it has not proved a similar presumption against baptisms conferred in the other sects. Just as the arguments produced (except perhaps the one based upon the prologue to the form in the Baptist rite) do not weaken the presumption that Baptist baptism must be considered valid, so too the presumption that Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregationalist baptisms are to be considered valid is not at all shaken. And, since the arguments to make Campbellite, Lutheran and Episcopalian baptisms appear doubtful are by far weaker than those offered to prove the presumption of invalidity in the case of Baptist baptisms, even that presumption of doubt is not established: therefore these latter also must still be presumed to be valid.

All the reasons advanced in the article in the February issue to support the presumptive invalidity of baptism conferred by Baptists,[17] Presbyterians, Methodists and Congregationalists as well as the presumptive doubt raised against the baptisms conferred by Campbellites, Lutherans and Episcopalians are of one and the same category, viz., the heretical tenets of the various sects are supposed to induce their ministers to elicit an intention which is insufficient and inadequate. All this is claimed to be based upon the principles laid down by Pope Leo XIII in his Apostolic Letter "*Apostolicae curae*" for distinguishing a presumptively valid intention from one presumptively invalid. Above it was proved, however, that in the paragraphs of those letters to which the article appeals the Pope did not base his principle concerning the presumption of an insufficient intention upon the heresy of the minister; neither did he base his conclusion of a defect of intention in conferring Orders according to the Anglican Ordinal directly and immediately upon Anglicans' views concerning Orders, but only indirectly and remotely in so far as their heresy prompted them to change the rite whereby they betrayed their positive insufficient and adverse intention.

What in the last analysis is the mistake underlying the principle enunciated and the conclusions arrived at in the article in the February issue? It was discovered that Protestant ministers might have what is sometimes called an "*intentio interpretativa*", namely that intention which they would be likely to form if they adverted to eliciting an express intention: and it is to this interpretative intention that it undertakes to apply the principle which Leo XIII formulated for judging an *explicit* intention, without, however, limiting its principle to the conditions laid down by the Pope. Dr. Donovan is content with deducing the insufficient and adverse intention from the heretical tenets of the Protestant minister: Pope Leo, however, requires that that intention be betrayed not merely and directly by the heretical notions of the minister, but by the change of rite introduced with the deliberate purpose of putting into practice what he holds in theory.

In this Pope Leo XIII does not lay down a new principle, but his principle is in entire accord with the law on similar

[17] This must be understood with the reservation made above, p. 144, in regard to the prefix to the form.

points and with decisions of ecclesiastical tribunals and in particular with those norms laid down by the Holy See in regard to baptism itself.

In the preceding pages the endeavor has been made to point out how erroneous it is to draw from the principles laid down by Leo XIII in the Apostolic Letter "*Apostolicae curae*" the conclusions arrived at in the article in the February issue of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW; it has been demonstrated that neither the presumptive invalidity of the baptisms conferred by Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists and Congregationalists nor the presumptive doubt against baptisms administered by Campbellites, Lutherans and Episcopalians can be proved from those principles. A further paper is intended to show positive reasons which urge that, in practice, the traditional rule of the Church be observed in judging such baptisms both as regards the validity of the sacrament itself and as regards the admission of converts from heretical sects or the validity of marriage contracted after baptism received in a heretical sect or the use of the Pauline Privilege.

VALENTINE SCHAAF, O.F.M.

Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

MONARCHS OF THE CAMPUS.

THE habit of seeking authority may generate a habit of mind which, from an educational viewpoint, is highly undesirable. Within the field of doctrine, morals, and Church policies, one may rightfully have recourse to the "argument from authority". The American mind, if one may postulate such an entity and gauge it from the political press, is unconciously and perpetually seeking authority at whose door it may lay the blame for this or that social evil. Our great political conflicts in times past, with possibly one exception, have been concerned more with persons than ideas. Political expediency to-day often demands that in case of the error of a political party, if one person may satisfy the public mind as accountable for the evil, he should pay the price that others may be spared, although the latter may have been more concerned with the expression of that thought in the form of objectionable law.

Leadership involves, in our day, firmness of mind and a care in expressing it; definite attitudes but a tender regard for the sensibilities of others in expanding them. Any movement whose leaders are discredited stands previously ordained for defeat. The attempt for the formation of a third political party a few years ago might have matured successfully, were the leaders of the other two satisfactorily discredited. The most telling blows aimed at the Church are those that make its priesthood the object of distrust and hatred.

The progress made, in educational fields, by non-sectarian universities, bespeaks eloquently trust in their leadership. Occasionally one hears rumblings of a contrary sentiment, of a movement that demands more than degrees as a qualification for the professorial rostrum. This sentiment may never attain realization because between the campuses and between professors there is growing an organization that tends to set its own standards. One of the few thoughts I carried away from a state university campus where my presence was required some few years ago is this: If the Catholic Church demanded the same amount of credence in its dogmatic and moral pronouncements as certain non-religious authorities demand in theirs, then the authority of the Church may well be called into question—as exceeding its Scriptural warrant.

This is all preliminary to a criticism of the technique of the critics of the Catholic college who have had their day of late. Had their thrusts been aimed with more thoughtfulness, they might have been aimed at those who are primarily responsible for collegiate affairs—the college presidents. Since these attacks dealt more with vague abstractions than persons, they are well nigh forgotten, although but a few months have elapsed since their verbose barrage.

Perhaps this critical silence speaks more significantly of the administration of the office of Catholic college president than can any words of mine. In his relations to his professorial confrères and in his relations to students, we have on record no indictment of the Catholic college president. There has been a slight indication of dissatisfaction regarding his relations with the public, but of that more later. To have authority without criticism is indeed a peculiar phenomenon in this day.

I.

The Catholic college, emphasizing as it does the element of personal direction and guidance, will prove untrue to its mission if it fails to realize that collegemen are more influenced by persons than theories and if it fails to present to college students a model or models which he may reproduce in himself. The First Model of the Catholic campus is, of course, Christ; His is the one predominant Personality reflected in part through others. Next to Him, the one set forth in boldest relief on the campus is that of the college president. His character may be real or mythical, but it exerts a tremendous influence upon imitative youth.

The college president imparts an indelible impress, not only through his own acts and speeches, but through the attitudes he generates in others. Especially is this true as regards the student body. If he has an open and a sympathetic mind for the troubles of the youthful student, then there is an inbreeding of docility and sympathy in the spirit of the students. And if the Catholic college should develop perchance the "I-Am-the-College" type, intolerant of the weaknesses of others, uncritical in passing judgments upon collegiate subjects, and superconscious of power, then there must flourish consequentially a lack of docility and sympathy.

The Catholic college president differs from other college presidents essentially in concept of life and in concept of a college; but of greater importance is the third essential difference, in his relations with students, in the fact that he is a priest. The power of academic life and death, which largely reposes in presidential hands, is a terrible weapon. No matter what proposition is placed before the priest-president, touching upon student lives either collectively or individually, the priestly character is bound to assert itself and to temper campus authority with that keen insight into human nature which is the peculiar prerogative of one exercising efficiently sacramental offices.

It may seem rather trite, in treating of his relations with students, to recall that the Catholic president is an educated man, educated at least for the office of priest and professor if not for that of president. In the frenzied campaigns of collegiate expansions, financial and otherwise, we witnessed a few

years past the installation of real estate men, generals, and high class publicists in presidential thrones. There is little danger that any save educated men may rule in Catholic college circles, men in whom there is an ingrained reverence for truth with a consciousness of their own limited power in seeking it, men who command confidence by the depth of their thought. Priestly qualities, however, supersede even these in the administration of student difficulties; the priest is *ex officio* a keen interpreter of human nature, primarily a mediator and incidentally a law-giver. Much of the misjudgment of college youth of our day, and their consequent maladjustment to collegiate ideals, is attributable to a misunderstanding and consequent mishandling of their grievances and difficulties. The exercise of presidential office demands more knowledge of human nature than of books.

It was rather inspiring, from a priestly viewpoint, to note in a recent survey of colleges, to what extent the priest-professor was trusted,[1] but *a fortiori* the statement may be reiterated of those who, as the outstanding priests of their respective colleges, enlist student confidence by a knowledge and appreciation of the spiritual and social values of life in the scholastic kingdoms over which they rule. There is no Catholic college in which vital decisions of students are not daily referred for approval or disapproval to the president. Sometimes the appearance of the student "on the carpet" is not wholly voluntary, but there is comfort even then in speaking to one who understands. The definition of an ideal government as that ruled over by "an angel and a despot" may or may not satisfy, for most people would prefer to have their destinies guided by one who has first-hand familiarity with human nature. The academic situation to-day wherein the college ruler is subject to no one whom he rules is irreconcilable to our democratic sense, unless we insure that those exercising this power are guided by the spirit of Christ and the unerring judgment of one who places the salvation of a single soul above the foundation of a new university. This assurance is generally one of the unadvertised prerogatives of the Catholic college.

[1] Cf. *Christ and the Catholic College*, p. 87.

II.

The relations of the Catholic college president with those who labor with him for a common cause are dictated primarily by the law of Christian charity and secondarily by the laws of educational expediency. With the former we are not here concerned. As regards the latter, there is a noteworthy change in the qualifications demanded of a Catholic college president to-day and twenty years ago.

Twenty years ago it was possible, in certain instances, to point out the college president as the man who knew more than everyone else about everything else. That day, with the progress of specialization on collegiate faculties, is passed. A character who would tend to monopolize the thinking of a college faculty to-day would make his college intellectually stagnant. The man generally selected to fill the office of president is the one who can best enlist the coöperative efforts of his professorial associates, who can so guide their peculiar talents and coördinate their efforts as to secure the maximum collegiate good. From an educational viewpoint, the president of to-day is neither a puppet nor a despot. He is primarily a good organizer, with a talent for using the genius of others perhaps more than his own. Generally, he selects his faculty; upon him lies the responsibility of keeping square professorial pegs from round academic holes. His is the obligation, in regulating the inter-professorial contacts, of seeing to it that young men are mollified in their impassioned enthusiasm for reforming the collegiate world over night and that old men may preserve religiously the sacrosanct traditions of the college. The wise college president then can neither be radical nor conservative.

There has been a growing tendency among American educational institutions to concentrate administrative problems in the hands of a few. Against this the American Association of University Professors wisely voices a warning. If men were specially trained for those functions, then such an oligarchy might be welcomed. Contrary to this tendency is that which insists upon the election of a college president from the faculty personnel. This insures a close personal relationship and understanding between professor and president. Some deem it educational suicide to appoint a ruler over a campus in which he has never taught.

The principle of control in Catholic colleges is not uniform. There are in all, however, channels of communication officially or unofficially established between the supreme executive and the faculty members. If one were to judge from results, the conditions which exist in certain American Catholic colleges investing one man with power supreme over others, for a limited time, generally with the understanding that he shall at the expiration of that time take his place among the ruled, are ideal.

And yet, is there not room for criticism in a principle of control that depends purely upon the spirit of coöperation for efficiency? Where institutions are carefully devised, with a constitution regulating them, and bylaws, and an organization expressed in parliamentary form, it seems that that happy spirit which makes effective most of our collegiate service might be better insured. There should be in every college machinery whereby an idea or ideal coming to any professor's mind might be proposed for the consideration of others and, if promoting the welfare and efficiency of the college, should become not only articulate but effective. To place upon the shoulders of the college president the responsibility both of thinking these ideas and insuring their consideration is to add to his superhuman tasks.

The primary thought of the Catholic college president both as regards students and professors seems to be, or rather, rightly is, the thought of service. The greatest service that can be rendered a professor is to guide him to the full realization of his natural aptitudes for fulfilling his supernatural office of priest-professor. If our Catholic colleges have been liable to criticism in not acclimating young professors to their academic duties properly, the criticism is not so much due to the college president as to institutions over which he has had no control. In securing the utmost efficiency from collegiate personnel, the college president will be quick to recognize superiority in any line, he will rejoice in finding talent anywhere, and he will recognize it with more care than others bestow on even large endowments. There is in this regard a significant passage in a tribute paid to the late Henry Adams: "He never liked to show that he saw farther or was any wiser than the person he was with and he usually took the attitude of being instructed."

So far we have emphasized merely the service the college president renders the student and professor. There is an obligation, sometimes in religious orders made explicit, of loyalty, of obedience, and of docility of the professor toward the head of the college. But does the obligation of the professor to collegiate harmony demand that he should not concern himself with any save personal scholastic problems? If so, that harmony might become slightly soporific. President Lueschner of the American Association of University Professors spoke well in his March pronouncement when he emphasized "constructive coöperation, based on sympathetic understanding, mutual respect, and good will between faculties and administration". But he goes further in a significant statement:

> It is the duty of faculty members to take an active interest in all matters pertaining to the efficiency of teaching and research in an institution. A faculty member who concerns himself solely with what pertains to himself or his own university, and who does not take an interest in solving problems of educational policy and of organization vital to higher education in general is lacking in a sense of responsiblity to his own calling.

Again it might be reasserted that the form of coöperation between faculty members and president is as unimportant as that of the method of coöperation between president and faculty members, provided the coöperation is mutual and actuated by high spiritual motives. But is an implicit understanding of these relations sufficient? A very good test of the efficiency of collegiate administration is a change of presidents. If it may be truthfully stated six months after his departure that a former president is no longer missed in the discharge of collegiate tasks, granting of course that his successor possesses some ability, then the older head has done his work effectively as far as his management of educational machinery is concerned. Personal influence is, of course, another consideration. If the college president is responsible for the influence he exerts upon students, he is likewise responsible for the moral training of the faculty. This sounds like an extreme statement, but the moral training which I have in mind is that of a willingness to learn and a willingness to serve

without personal motives or interests entering into that consideration. Where such willingness exists in our Catholic colleges to-day (and I think it is quite general) it is usually traceable to some collegiate ruler, past or present, who zealously protected that quality, or to the example of his humility in learning from others, or to his common sense in realizing that the president is for the college and not the college for the president.

III.

The only expression of criticism of the Catholic college president that greeted my eye during those months in which the Catholic college was the center of controversy occurred when he was accused of not taking the place in the public sight which other college presidents were wont to assume. This criticism is quite general and *cum fundamento in re*. The American campus ruler, as a genus, has basked in the sunlight of publicity and press-agency; he has monopolized to a certain extent the editorial page, the speakers' table, and the rostrum; he has benignly tendered his guidance to the world at large, to think out its problems or to reform its ways. Why then does not the Catholic college president take more cognizance of his advantageous position? The ultimate reason, in my mind, is in the peculiar consciousness he possesses that the college is a little world in itself, a world which needs a ruler and preferably not a ruler *in absentia*.

And yet the Catholic college president can not escape the demands of the age. He must represent the college to the public with the same care and precision he represents the faculty to the student body or vice versa. He must represent alma mater to alumni; he must represent the learning of the Catholic Church to Rotarian, Kiwanian, and Lion; he must represent parental solicitude to the student; in the multitudinous investigations of our day he must represent the cause of higher Christian education as well as exemplify it. He must be a politician in his treatment of politicians, a business man in his dealings with commercial men, a diplomat in his contacts with those upon whom the financial welfare of the college may depend, and he must ever be a willing victim, a

holocaust to public opinion, in case anything does go wrong in his college, in order that the stigma may not be collegiate but personal.

Perhaps the most delicate task the Catholic college president faces to-day is that of representing the interests of Christian truth and wisdom where financial and educational expediency may demand other considerations. After all the Catholic Church has its views in economics, in social relations, which cover to a certain extent political relations, in medicine, and in law. Representation of these views will not always enlist the enthusiastic support that one might expect from the public; misrepresentation will do grave harm.

And yet in his public relations the Catholic college president has a distinct asset in his priesthood. While others are generically assumed to be scheming new endowments or devising "new-fangled" educational nonsense, his priestly character generally preserves the Catholic president from those charges. Yet he must remember that the average business man with whom he comes in contact is quite complacent in his intellectual mediocrity and he does not wish to be disturbed. Perhaps it might be just as well to concentrate the disturbance upon those who are engaged in activities of life which demand depth of thought and philosophy of life. Yet among these it is the common lot of presidents of Catholic colleges, who appeal to the older ideals of education, to be classified as prejudiced, narrow-minded, and hopelessly ignorant; of those who are progressive, to be judged as disturbers, liberalists, intolerant of the principles of others who have not time in which to change their principles. Perhaps the wisest advice that could be given a Catholic college president entering into public relations is that "Eubulia", that disposition outlined in St. Thomas by which we are disposed to take advice, is a term not common in our day among those who for commercial reasons must listen to the *motu proprio's* of intellectual leadership.

Conclusion.

Those who hold the cause of Catholic College education in tender solicitude have given more attention of late years to financial endowments than to the endowment of consecrated lives. A notable contribution to the latter could be effected

by prolonging the life of service and lightening the responsibilities which tradition fixes in the office of the Catholic college president. Two of the bishops whose untimely deaths the Church in America has mourned during the past year devoted the most active years of their lives as college presidents. One suggestion to lighten his burden and to make more effective the service of the president to the college is that the public defense and propaganda of the Catholic college be taken over largely by alumni priests not engaged in professorial work. The collegiate personnel is too limited to-day for professorial tasks within the collegiate halls. To concentrate upon one man, the president, the task of representing the college at all times and places is to superburden the fathers of collegiate households. There may be occult compensations for the labors that are theirs, but Divine Benevolence would certainly not be offended if the life of service of those who are leaders in the Church's great educational ideal were by judicious coöperation extended.

Dubuque, Iowa.

THE ARCHBISHOP'S POCKET-BOOK.

XI. Young Father Gleeson.

THE Archbishop's schedule, as a note on the desk indicated, took him on an early June day to the Convent of St. Catherine, where he was to preside at the Commencement exercises of the school.

The nuns had good taste. So had the Archbishop; and they were aware of it. This kept the exercises within proper limits, both as to time and in the expression of mutual appreciation of honors and merits. His Grace, when he spoke, avoided platitudes and exaggerations alike. He made it a point to lay stress on the value of religious education, and he knew how to illustrate the various graces which flow from the training imparted by the religious, in a way which gave variety to his talks on such occasions, and made them impressive as well as interesting.

Father Martin, as an old friend of the community, was of course in attendance. On the whole he managed to escape

ceremonial occasions, unless he had to take an active part in them. His plea was that nature had constituted him a work animal, that he had none of the ornamental qualities which were required for exhibitions, and that anyhow there never was any lack on such occasions of people who were both willing and felt that they had the leisure to fill vacant chairs with sufficient grace and thereby encourage the actors. All they had to do was to express admiration for what they saw and heard, as that was the chief purpose for which they had been invited and were to be feasted. At St. Catherine's he was at home. Accordingly he disappeared and went to the infirmary, where some sick nuns were to be cheered. They welcomed him, for they felt that his sympathy would relieve their suffering.

When at the close of the exercises the Archbishop was about to leave and enter his carriage a young priest came forward to greet him.

"Father Gleeson!" said His Grace cordially. "Your homeward journey, if I mistake not, lies on the way to the cathedral. We shall be glad to have you along with us, unless your pastor insists on your attendance at his own table. Come!"

The young priest appeared slightly confused at the unlooked-for invitation, but silently accepted. As he was about to take his seat with the driver, Father Martin, feeling that the Archbishop would want to talk to the priest, rose and said that he was glad to resign his place in the car, because he wanted a walk very badly, and His Grace would not much miss him."

As a matter of fact the prelate was anxious to ascertain how Father Gleeson liked his new curacy. The latter was one of the recently ordained men of whom his superior had great hopes by reason of his fine talent, allied with natural modesty and apparent unconsciousness of his gifts. He had marked ability both as a preacher and a writer. The close intercourse during the last year with the theological students had given the Archbishop an opportunity of gauging their particular bent of mind and of getting glimpses of their fitness for parish work. This young man had at first been a puzzle to him because of a certain reticence and shyness. But on examination he found him to have not only knowledge of his theology,

but good judgment, and a certain quality of spiritual discernment which augured well for his future as a director of souls. What His Grace wanted to know was whether the contact with the outside world, under the management of a shrewd and practical-minded pastor, had developed any new phase of disposition or character, which might either confirm or weaken the Archbishop's anticipations regarding the young priest.

"I noticed the name of the valedictorian at the Commencement, a Miss Gleeson. Is she a relative of yours?"

"She is a cousin, Your Grace," replied the junior.

"A fine type of the Catholic girl of Irish blood, to judge by her address and manner. Perhaps you helped her to say some of the things about Catholic education which the address contained?"

"O, no. She is quite clever and knows probably more about the subject she talked about than I do," was the simple reply.

"You should not say that, Father Gleeson, after going through a course of theology, not to speak of pedagogics and metaphysics of which, I believe, you are quite fond. These young ladies learn their wisdom at second hand, from Ruskin and Tennyson, whereas you go to the *Summa* of the Angelic Doctor."

"I don't know, Your Grace. They assimilate wisdom somehow, it seems to me, by certain qualities of the heart which are superior to the reasonings of the head. I had a talk with one of the nuns the other day. She teaches my cousin, and has a high opinion of the girl's mental gifts. While upon the subject of study of philosophy for women, as it is followed in our modern secondary schools and universities, she showed a surprising familiarity with the problems of metaphysics and ethics. She did not insist so much on the conventional aspects and sources of information which one might glean from reading; but her views indicated an originality enforced by illustration which made me think she had mastered the earlier Scholastics, who flourished before the time of St. Thomas. Yet she had never read any of their works. She knew, of course, the trend and general method of the medieval doctors, and how they taught from observation of nature."

"Did she give you any indication of the sources from which she actually did draw her knowledge?"

"O, yes. She spoke of the presence and manifestations of God in his creatures, especially in children. It seemed to me that she saw God with a vividness in things of earth which recalled the symbolism of the mystic theologians."

The young priest was warming up to his subject and the Archbishop seemed anxious to draw him out.

"Did she refer to no definite reading of the older theologians, such as St. Albert or St. Bernard of Clairvaux?"

"It may seem odd to say it, but I believe she derived her knowledge of a keen penetration into the designs of the Creator regarding man and nature, from simply wishing to do His will."

"Not so odd after all," remarked the Archbishop. "Conformity to the will of God would mean a continuous process of purification of the heart. *The clean of heart shall see God.* That is a fundamental doctrine of the all-wise Teacher who came to interpret to man His heavenly Father's will. Isn't it just that which makes children often utter the most profound truths—*ex ore infantium et lactentium perfecisti laudem?* That is, of course, because God made them so—*fecit linguas infantium disertas.* They don't have to learn, as we have to do. But did your friend explain how God gives wisdom to children, and then allows them to grow dull and begin the process of learning it over again?"

"That was one of the things she particularly dwelt upon," said the young priest.

"How?"

"She related some curious incidents of how young children under instruction view religious facts. She had been preparing for Confirmation a little maid who had been told of the great importance of the Holy Ghost and how He came to sanctify the soul after the Heavenly Father had created it and the Divine Son had redeemed it. Quite naively the child asked: 'If the Holy Ghost perfects the soul, and is so important, why do we put Him last when we make the sign of the cross?'"

"And could she answer that question?" asked the Archbishop.

"O, yes, your Grace. She said to the child: 'When your father takes you out for a walk he lets you and mother go first.

He goes last, for though he is very important and loves you as much as himself, he wants to make you feel sure—that is, to strengthen you and all that is before you. The Holy Ghost is like the Father and the Son, but when He goes with you He goes last.'"

"Did she explain why the child after growing up should have to learn wisdom, when the Creator had already given it because of the clean heart, such as the innocent possess before they can commit sin?"

"Yes," answered Father Gleeson. "She pointed out how a father might show or for a time give to a child and then withdraw a beautiful thing so that it could earn its continued possession."

"I see. And she believed that conformity to the will of God produces a wisdom superior to that of the scientists and the worldly wise."

"Yes, your Grace. 'The heart of the child,' she said, 'is a mirror in which God images Himself. The misuse of liberty, which growing maturity brings with reason, and the development of the natural faculties by which man is to merit the inheritance of heaven, tarnish the mirror. The friction of penance and the waters of repentance cleanse it again, so that the image of God may be restored.'"

"That would mean that study or human knowledge is superfluous, since works of penance suffice to bring about the purification of the heart."

"Not that, as she showed," said Father Gleeson. "Knowledge, such as comes from the study of nature and of God's operations in general, is the light by which we recognize the image of God. The mirror and the object to be reflected require light for the production of the reflection."

"So human knowledge is necessary after all," continued the Archbishop. "That would imply the need of natural science with its reasonings for the attainment of wisdom, for without science we should lack the light demanded for the reproduction of the divine image in the soul."

"Human science, when it acts as the immediate instrument of God, is, she maintained, only a branch of theology. By itself, or when separated from its source, it fails to produce the effect of wisdom and remains barren knowledge. Wisdom acts differently."

"How?" asked His Grace.

"In the same way in which natural light, that is the light of the sun, produces effects, not only illuminating but warming and carrying with it a certain power of attraction, of storing and of production."

"I see," said the prelate. "You compare human knowledge to the artificial light that gives brilliance to the object upon which it falls, but cannot produce growth."

"Just so," Father Gleeson eagerly replied. "Sunlight, even when its direct rays are not apparent, produces a brilliance which simultaneously carries warmth. So knowledge produced from conformity to the will of God, generates a fervor which, added to the will power, increases the energy of our motives. In like manner the grace of God proceeding from doing His will acts as the sunlight. It moves. But that is not its sole effect. In a silent way it penetrates into the depths through clay and hard rock, stirs the growing life beneath the surface, and makes it seek those things which tend directly to its perfection."

"I see," said the Archbishop, continuing the argument. "And did she account for the differences of individual souls?"

"Yes, your Grace. God's conscious presence acts upon the development through education of each child precisely in the same way as the sun acts upon the different germs of growing plant-life. The small tendrils of vegetable growth beneath the ground begin to move under the action of the sun in spring. They spread out their tiny organs into the moist soil and search for such chemical, mineral and organic matter as will contribute to their peculiar growth and development in substance, form, color, scent, nourishing and medicinal qualities which the horticulturist and the medical botanist seek in them. All this process of selection of elements, of directing their movements into certain channels, and of bringing them to the surface, so as to display their beauty and utility, goes on without any noise or ostensible direction from without. It is quite spontaneous so long as it occurs within the domain of the sun. No human sagacity could furnish the same sure and continuous supervision and direction producing like marvellous results.

"And this, she maintained, is what the religious atmosphere of education consists of. It teaches the child to recognize and do God's will. That is to say, it gets the soul into the light of the Divine presence. With that all else goes to produce the highest perfection of intelligence, beauty of character, useful service. It operates precisely like the plant under the sunlight, which gives beauty, nourishment and medicine for the needs of life. No artificial light can produce the same effects."

The Archbishop's carriage had nearly reached the cathedral when the driver was suddenly obliged to halt owing to a temporary blocking of the thoroughfare. A drunken man was staggering across the street, pursued by a woman with a child in her arms. She was evidently bent on bringing him back into the house on the opposite side of the street. On an open wagon in front reclined the figure of another man, apparently just placed there. His bleeding head was being bound up by the driver. As it was evidently an accident case the Archbishop and the young priest both got out of the carriage and went over to inquire the condition of the injured man. They might be of service if he were a Catholic or even if he were not.

It turned out that there had been a street fight occasioned by a drunken brawl in a neighboring saloon. The young priest assumed charge of the case at once. He took a strong hold of the intoxicated man and led him into the house, followed by the wife carrying her child, and loudly blessing the cleric. The police intervened shortly. But the Archbishop spoke to the officer, and the case was left in the hands of Father Gleeson, while the prelate returned to the cathedral unaccompanied.

He had taken note of the address of the unfortunate people and had insisted on the young priest reporting to him details of the conditions that same evening, since they were within the cathedral parish.

As a result Tom Burns found on the following morning a note in the pocket-book of His Grace giving directions regarding the matter. One of the assistants was to inquire into the home-life of the parties who had been in the turmoil of the

previous evening. His Grace required minute details regarding the occupation, support, rent, children and general dependence of the occupants of the house where the trouble had occurred. He also sent out inquiry about the condition of the injured man in the wagon. The St. Vincent de Paul Society was to take charge of the case, but meanwhile the Archbishop's pocket-book might be relied upon for any necessary supplies.

When Father Gleeson arrived on the evening of the accident to report matters, the prelate was with Father Martin, his vicar. The latter knew and liked the young priest. They talked over the condition of the poor in the city districts, and Father Gleeson showed that he had already gathered much pastoral wisdom from his experience in the adjacent districts.

"Father Gleeson, you have been of great service to us this evening, and I should want to see a little more of you. But your Reverend Pastor will be anxious about you. How are you getting on with him? They say Father Cantwell is a strict disciplinarian, and he will probably nourish a grudge against his Archbishop for keeping one of his assistants away from duty at home. Perhaps he will be displeased with you for attending a sick call in the cathedral parish."

"No, Your Grace, not if I tell him the circumstances, and that it was your wish that I should do so."

"Well, pastors in these days are apt to insist on being popes in their own parishes. And the Ordinary depends on them for his cathedraticum. You see, an Archbishop cannot do much if his pocket-book remains empty. We have to keep the pastors in good humor just as I suppose the pastors have to do with the assistants in the parish, if they want to keep alive."

"I hear Father Gleeson stands all right with his pastor," said the vicar. "They say he takes the old man's temperature every morning at breakfast; and, if need be, gives him a tonic to keep him in good humor. It is the other two assistants who suffer from the pastoral blood-pressure—and the housekeeper."

"There might indeed be some difficulty with the parochial matron. Complaints sometimes come to the Ordinary that the pastors are not the only ones who lord it over the parish. In the case of St. Philip's matters are very likely much exaggerated," said the Archbishop with a twinkle in his eyes.

He had a pleasant way of sounding his priests on domestic relations, where he felt that it would give no offence.

"There is no trouble with the servants," replied the priest. He was non-committal, and the vicar, seeing it, broke in:

"Why, I have the story from good authority, though it may be merely well invented, how you got the better of the cook. They say she was greatly in favor with the old man because she knew how to prepare a good Irish stew which fitted in admirably with the traditioinal way of the pastor's making a good punch after dinner. But now the favorite is Father Gleeson."

"How?" queried the young curate, pleased with being made the pastoral hero.

"Well, what I heard was this," said the ingenious vicar. "Old Father Cantwell, as everybody in his house knows, is a crank on punctuality. To avoid excuses of the assistants about their time-pieces being out of harmony with his own, he keeps but one clock in the house down on the lower stairway, so that everybody coming and going can see the hour. It made matters especially agreeable for the cook who could have things ready with all the hot dishes on the table, the moment the pastor appeared in the dining-room. The domestics prided themselves on their being invariably on time, and that this accounted for the excellent digestion and the healthy looks of pastor and curates. Father Cantwell used to quote the fact, and so long as the cook remained in the house everything went well. She became a sort of patron saint of the house, and the old man would say: 'Bridget is a gem, an emerald; you couldn't get another like her. I believe she is the source and fountain of the prosperity of the parish.' Well, in a way she was. She kept in well with the butcher, the baker, the provision dealer. The altar boys were always on time because she put the cookies they were to get, after Mass, on the window when they passed by, as if to say: 'You can get them if you are here on the minute.' The assistants were of no account, unless it were that they caused extra trouble by coming in late now and then, in spite of the domestic arrangements and traditions. When Father Gleeson was appointed as third assistant, the housekeeper eyed him with suspicion as being an additional prospect of irregularity. But he beat her entirely."

"Was it wholly by his gentle forbearance and punctuality or by his good appetite?" asked His Grace.

"Neither," said the vicar, "amount to much in the eyes of the womenfolk, whose spiritual training was in the hands of the pastor. He had taught them by implication that assistants were necessary evils in a parish, and that to please them overmuch was next to a mortal sin."

"How then did he manage to alienate their affections?" asked the Archbishop.

"He conceived the original idea of setting the house-clock fifteen minutes back, sometime before noon," went on Father Martin. "Then just before the dinner hour he put it ahead again. When the Angelus rang, exactly with the first stroke of twelve by the clock on the stairway, the old man and his assistants, having recited the prayer, went promptly down to the table. Then they found that things were not ready. The assistants grumbled, of course, and Father Cantwell, greatly perturbed at the irregularity, inquired the cause. No one seemed to know. The potatoes and roast had been put in the oven exactly at the moment required for their proper perfection, to reach the table at twelve. How it happened otherwise no one but Father Gleeson could tell, and he said not a word.

"When the thing had happened three or four times in succession (for Father Gleeson knew precisely what everybody was doing, and watched his opportunity for the right moment to move the hands of the clock), the cook as well as the housekeeper gradually lost the old man's confidence. Not only did they plainly appear to be getting negligent, but they seemed to insist on telling lies about it. The final result was that Father Cantwell came to distrust the womenfolk of his household. Father Gleeson became the sole trustee. As he somehow found excuses for the servants, he had their good will as well as that of the old man."

"And what does Father Gleeson say to all this revelation of his tricks, compromising a venerable pastor and his household?" asked the prelate.

The young priest laughed.

"Father Martin deserves a patent for inventing the story. I am quite satisfied with the way our good old pastor manages his house, assistants and domestics. We are a happy family, though he keeps us on the treadmill."

[TO BE CONTINUED]

Studies and Conferences

Questions, the discussion of which is for the information of the general reader of the Department of Studies and Conferences, are answered in the order in which they reach us. The Editor cannot engage to reply to inquiries by private letter.

MARYKNOLL MISSION LETTERS.

Peter Che is the "Last of the Barons"—the Warwick of Korea, or "Cromwell", guiltless of his country's blood. Peter's mud castle is set amongst big gnarled pine trees on the spur of a mountain. Aloft, behind the house fantastic, sky-scraping peaks look down paternally; and below it, with here and there a "desert isle unsolaced by the sea", stretches the magic carpet of the blue Pacific. So sitting in his throne room he may gaze up with contempt on the majesty of the crags or look down, spurning the infinity of the ocean, while always the murmuring pines and the rumbling surge tender him kingly music. A stupendous setting for a ruler. Of course the Japanese rule has taken away much of his temporal power, leaving him only to command a leaky fishing fleet, to direct the tillers of his rocky fields, and to awe the islanders by glance and voice instead of scepter. But he still dictates to them—according to the Faith of course—the law of religion.

Peter is hoary with eighty-two winters, which he carries lightly in a lithe powerful frame, and records in a long white beard, which is so abundant that many a woman would be glad to wear it on the top of her scalp. His hair, of the same color, is long and bound in a knot on the top of his head, with an old-fashioned, bird-cage, Korean hat sitting aloft of all. As for his countenance, it is hard to conjecture whether it is more like Sitting Bull's or Charlemagne's.

This is the gentleman whom I was warned not to cross or oppose in anything, and who filled the doorway of the mud-walled castle in answer to our timid knocks. Quaking like hothouse damsels, and murmuring most respectful greetings, the little catechist and I introduced ourselves and endured his inspection. We must have passed favorably under his fierce gaze, for with a command to his wife of seventy-two years to

bring hot on our trail, wine, fried eggs, bean curd and chestnuts, he led us up the hill to the chapel which he built with his own hands. It was made of very sturdy beams, mud walls, and tile roof, heated by connecting flues below the floor—between the fireplace at one end and the chimney at the other. Within was a well-built altar around which hung pictures of bearded bishops and priests martyred in Korea, and before which lay a rug with the figure of a tiger. The only other adornments of the chapel were a mass of Peter's fishing nets hanging on the walls, and his coffin—not the usual fittings of a chapel but as appropriate as any. I can't say that Peter selected them as spiritual symbols; it may merely have been a convenient place to store them—but what could be more touching reminders in the holy place than the apostolic nets of the first Peter, those symbols of life's work; and the box for one's bones, calling forcibly to mind the end of work, rest, and the littleness of all below. It takes a good man to look his coffin in the face daily. Peter made his own coffin and it occurred to me he never thought to stretch himself in it, to see if it fit, for comparing the sizes of the box and the man, it was apparent that Peter was going to find it a tight squeeze to get all inside. However, that was not my business, and it may have been part of Peter's humor to give the boys at the obsequies a little worry before disposing of him.

While we sat gazing at these things Peter's wife brought the refreshments, during the eating and drinking of which we became such devoted friends that Peter gave me the royal compliment of averring that he and I would stick together till death. It was brought about in this way.

Peter has a story which the whole incredulous world ridicules—not to his terrible face of course, but enough behind his back for him to sense it; and the most kingly thing about Peter is that the adverse judgment of the world doesn't cause in him the least doubt. Peter is alone in the world with his wife, never having had a child. Now, his septuagenerian spouse told him fifteen years ago that he was to have a son and Peter would in no way doubt her word. These many years have passed and the promised son has not been born; but still Peter believes that the boy—or rather, the youth—will appear. His explanation, which is known at all the hearths in North

Korea, is that the son is waiting until Worea is free; and when the Korean King is again on his throne, then, and not till then, will he come forth; and when he does arrive no ordinary priest will baptize him, for Peter has decreed that the honor must be reserved to the Pope. Having heard the story many times, I was able to keep a solemn countenance during the telling of the tale, though I had to call on heaven many times to help me. But after all, we have had Zachary, Elizabeth and John the Baptist; and why not, Peter, Anna with her seventy-two years and Noja. Noja is the name of the son, christened before birth by the incredulous friends of Peter after a certain character in Chinese history, who, according to the story, was born at eighty years of age, appearing first to the world as a white-haired, shriveled little old man. No doubt, the first things that Peter's son, Noja, will demand, will not be the rubber nipple or rattle box, but a gillette, a cigarette and a pair of oxford bags.

While Peter left to summon the Christians from far and near into his chapel, the afternoon wore off with a nap and a stroll up the mountain side. A few rods from the chapel I started a deer from thick covert and pine-needle bed. Taking a few graceful leaps away, it stood peering at me with soft, wide eyes. Now I defy the hardest-hearted hunter to look a deer in the eye and then shoot it. It is easier to shoot a baby. While I tried to exchange the pheasant shot in the gun for shells suitable to the deer, the slender phantom of the forests vamoosed, and being moonstruck that day for having had a side-glance at the beast's eye, I was just as glad. So with a light game bag and conscience I went out on the spur to see what the setting sun was doing to the mountains and sea, and it certainly was splashing Coney Island all over them, as our New York cousins would say.

After dinner Peter introduced six converts whom he had rounded up and instructed for baptism. I forgot to note that before all repasts, priest and catechist being present, Peter blessed the food with the sign of the cross, not on his own person but with a larger gesture over the table than I have ever known any bishop to make. These converts who came after the big blessing and dinner, were three men, two ladies and a child. I was told before that Peter drove as many out of the

church as he caught in his apostolic nets, but anyway these new converts seemed most earnest and most desirable acquisitions. After trying to show our happiness with duly paid compliments and felicitations, the catechist and I started to examine the converts' doctrine and there the trouble started. Peter would have none of our examinations. Hadn't he instructed them himself, and wasn't that sufficient? The catechist who received the brunt of the attack appealed to me. I assured Peter that in all other cases it certainly was sufficient, but for initiation into the church official examination was required. That didn't satisfy Peter. He stormed about the chapel like a blind Samson ready to pull the roof down on our heads, then flew out the door roaring against the catechist.

All proved well-enough instructed but one poor woman who didn't even know how many Gods there were. We told her to study more with the hope of baptizing her after a few months on our next visit. But she took her disappointment to Peter, who came back into the chapel like a Kansas cyclone and fell again on the catechist. We tried to placate him by having him examine the woman himself; but he said that the matter was closed and that by decree of the Church a woman must be baptized with her husband. We waived that as a regulation of certain backward dioceses and urged him to set the lady right on her doctrine. The came another assault on the catechist and exit Peter with another grand finale. Then we baptized our five converts. Peter's wife going sponsor for the lady who passed and Peter coming back to be sponsor for the men. Peter, in all this, is not such an exception. Where it is possible to humor the Oriental according to his prejudices, it must be done; and usually where a fixed rule of the Church stands in the way, he will sacrifice his face and bow his head if he is a real Catholic; which Peter is.

The few old believers were then called for confession, and next morning new and old received Communion. Peter and the catechist were at peace again. Among other things told us by Peter at breakfast was the fact that before his conversion, many years ago, he belonged to some Protestant sect, and at that time, being a rich man, he had built for them from his own purse a large church in the town of Sensen. If our superior would send a priest to Sensen, Peter would make the Protes-

tants give him back his church. We begged him to let them keep the old church. But Peter says, "No"; he would take it back anyway.

I left the old King with a heavy heart. He swept his big arm around at the scenery and asked me to remain in that beautiful place where the trees looked down serenely at the ceaseless battle between the ocean and mountains—it was good for the health; the hunting was the best; and besides, Peter would like a priest to stay near him, for he knows that some time the lid must be fixed on that coffin of his, and when his big frame droops he fears that the long distance which separates us may not permit me to arrive in time for the last sacraments.

But it was sad to see him there so lonesome. The harvest had been gathered; his fishing boats were beached till the spring. During the long winter nights he had nothing to do but sit in his cabin listening to the north winds lashing the other giants of nature around him and wait for his son, Noja, and the freedom of his country.

JOSEPH A. SWEENEY, A.F.M.

Hiken, Korea.

THE EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS AND THE GOTHIC VESTMENT.

Qu. At a meeting of priests, while the Eucharistic Congress was being held, the question of "Gothic" chasubles came up. To my surprise there were still priests prominently identified with liturgical reform who objected to the use or introduction of the chasuble commonly called "Gothic". I thought the matter had been amply ventilated in the REVIEW, but someone pointed out that the "Gothic" chasuble could be used only where it had been introduced before the decree of 1863 was published; and that now one has to apply to Rome, before its use may be adopted. Must the bishop of the diocese state his special reasons to the S. Congregation before allowing it? Such is the contention of some who so interpret the explanations given in the March issue of the REVIEW.

Resp. We are not aware of any official pronouncement made by representatives of the liturgical reform at the Eucharistic Congress regarding the subject of sacred vestments. Whatever expressions there have been against the use or continuance of the beautiful and dignified form of chasuble known

among us as the Gothic, proceeds from undue zeal and a too literal interpretation of the liturgical legislation.

The distinction between the early medieval Gothic and the modified Gothic adopted by St. Charles and the pontifical rubricist Gavantus after the Council of Trent, has been sufficiently made clear in the REVIEW. We have also emphasized the fact that Rome disapproves of any concerted movement, savoring of innovation, which would seek to substitute this form of Gothic for the traditional Roman chasuble sanctioned in the Latin Church since the fifteenth century. With these two fundamental restrictions in mind bishops and priests are at liberty, until a definite new rule be laid down, to wear the conventional "Gothic" chasuble, which is distinctly rubrical.

Since the matter was discussed in the REVIEW, well known interpreters of Catholic liturgical observance, such as the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* (Avril, 1926) and the *Revue Apologétique* (15 Mai, 1926), have expressed this opinion. The contentions of Père Powels, S.J., in the former review imply that the Gothic vestment, as here understood, is far more in keeping with the text of the *Ceremoniale Episcoporum* and the *Ritus servandus in Celebratione Missae* than nine-tenths of the chasubles worn at Mass in the churches of France, Spain, North America, and other countries where the making of ecclesiastical articles has become industrialized.

The Ceremonial of Bishops (L. 2, c. 8, n. 19) states: "Episcopus induitur planeta quae hinc inde *super brachia* aptatur, et *revolvitur, ne illum impediat.*" Similarly the rubric of the Missal (Ritus servandus in Celebratione Missae, VIII, 6) has this instruction for the server of Mass: "Minister manu sinistra elevat fimbrias posteriores planetae, *ne Celebrantem impediat in elevatione brachiorum.*" Surely this could hardly be said of the skimped modern chasuble? The *Revue Théologique* quotes with approval Fr. J. Braun, S.J., an authority on paramentics, and Callewaert, the Belgian rubricist, Genicot the theologian, as well as the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, implying that these are sufficiently reliable interpreters of the Roman legislation. Until Rome makes a new and definitely reversing decision, which does not seem likely in view of the terms used in the *Ceremoniale Episcoporum* and the *Missal*, there is no need of further discussion of this subject.

DE OFFICIIS ET JURIBUS PAROCHI RELIGIOSI JUXTA NORMAS A JURE NOVISSIMO LATAS.

(Casus Juris)

P. Joannes a Ministro Provinciali institutus est oeconomus conventus, in quo bona quoque paroeciae sunt administranda. P. Philippus ad pastorale munus evectus, plenam bonorum paroeciae administrationem, necnon pecuniae depositionem apud se sibi vindicat: utrumque enim—ipse ait—praescriptis Codicis innitur. P. Joannes e contra sustinet sibi jus esse retinendi apud se nedum pecuniam domus, sed illam quoque quae a paroecia quomodocumque provenit; idque, eius opinione, vi regulae atque CC. GG. Ordinis, quae cum a S. Apostolica post promulgationem Codicis approbatae fuerint, omnem vim suam servant.

Unde quaeritur:

I. An Constitutiones et Regulae singularum Religionum respectu Codicis omnem vim suam retineant?

II. Quaenam officia et iura parocho religioso inhaereant?

III. Utrum ad parochum religiosum spectet plena bonorum paroeciae administratio?

IV. Num parocho religioso ius insit retinendi apud se pecuniam, quae a paroecia provenit?

Resolutio.—Ad I. Hoc quaesitum distinctione opus habet, nempe: si istae regulae et particulares constitutiones non sunt Codici contrariae, omnem suam vim servant; si vero Codici opponantur, abrogatae sunt. Ita declaratur a Jure Novissimo in c. 489.—Quod interpretandum est ad normam c. 6, n. 1 et c. 4, nempe: regulae et constitutiones cum sint verae leges particulares vi c. 6, n. 1 vigent, *nisi* Codici opponantur et nisi contrarium Codex caveat; privilegia vero in regulis contenta et a S. Sede alicui religioni concessa, cum inter iura quaesita censeantur, integra manent nisi huius Codicis canonibus expresse revocentur.[1]

Ad II. Officia et iura parocho religioso inhaerentia a Jure Novissimo determinantur in Can. 630, qui sic exprimitur:

§ 1. Religiosus, qui paroeciam regit sive titulo parochi sive titulo vicarii, manet adstrictus ad observantiam votorum et

[1] Cocchi, *Comment. Cod.*, IV, p. 20.

constitutionum, quatenus haec observatio potest cum muneris sui officiis consistere.

§ 2. Quare, in iis quae ad religiosam disciplinam attinent, subest Superiori, cuius proinde est, et quidem privative respectu Ordinarii loci, in eius agendi rationem circa haec omnia inquirere eumque, si casus ferat, corrigere.

§ 3. Bona quae ipsi obveniunt intuitu paroeciae cui praeficitur, ipsi paroeciae acquirit; cetera acquirit ad instar aliorum religiosorum.

§ 4. Non obstante voto paupertatis, eidem licet eleemosynas in bonum paroecianorum, vel pro scholis catholicis aut locis piis paroeciae coniunctis, quovis modo oblatas accipere aut colligere, et acceptas sive collectas administrare, itemque, servata offerentium voluntate, pro prudenti suo arbitrio, erogare, salva semper vigilantia sui Superioris; sed eleemosynas pro ecclesia paroeciali aedificanda, conservanda, instauranda, exornanda accipere, apud se retinere, colligere aut administrare pertinet ad Superiores, si ecclesia sit communitatis religiosae; secus ad loci Ordinarium.[2]

Ut quae circa huius canonis applicationem dicturi sumus facilius intelligantur, sequentia declarare perutile ducimus:

(a) *Administrare* bona idem est ac bona temporalia gerere iuxta propriam naturam et fines suos proprios, seu *ex una parte* ita agendo ut bona frugifera fructus ferant, bona consumptibilia utiliter consumentur, et *quidem* salva substantia eorum quae servanda sunt; *ex alia autem parte* attendatur ad oblatorum voluntatem et intentionem, necnon ad proprias religionis constitutiones.

(b) Administratio bonorum temporalium pertinet ad Superiores et sub horum directione ad oeconomos.[3]

(c) *Eleemosynae administrari possunt, quin opus sit eas apud se retinere.* Hoc in primis evidenter deducitur ab ipso can. 630, nempe a secunda parte paragraphi 4, in qua declaratur parochum eleemosynas pro ecclesia paroeciali aedificanda, conservanda, instauranda, exornanda "administrare," "apud se retinere . . . " non posse.

[2] Cf. Prümmer, p. 331; Blat, p. 700; Vermeersch, I, n. 730; Fanfani, *De Jure Religiosorum*, n. 349; Augustine, III, *Religious and Laymen*, p. 361; Micheletti, Jus *Religiosorum*, p. 328; Cocchi, *Comment. Cod.*, IV, pp. 218-219.

Si ecclesia, apud quam residet communitas religiosa sit simul paroecialis, servetur, congrua congruis referendo, praescriptum can. 415 (Can. 609, 1°).

[3] Cocchi, *Comment. Cod.*, IV, pp. 94-95.

Itaque, nisi dicere velimus verbum "retinere" in canone inutiliter fuisse appositum, aut legislatorem insipienter locutum fuisse—quae sane absque iniuria legislatoris asseri nequeunt—eleemosynas administrare haud secum fert eas apud se retinere.

Porro, ex can. 1516, 2, Superior munere *administratoris* fungitur, quin officium oeconomi exerceat.[4] Ergo unum sine altero ex his officiis perfecte consistere potest. Ergo eleemosynae administrari possunt, quin apud se retineantur.

(d) Idem dicendum est de eleemosynarum erogatione, scilicet *eleemosynae optime erogari possunt, quin ullimode opus sit eas apud se retinere.*

Procul dubio eleemosynas "erogare" significat eas *distribuere, subministrare, dare, impendere, uti, adhibere.* Atqui jugis experientia docet eleemosynas posse distribui, subministrari, etc. absque earumdem apud se detentione; sicut accidit, ut aliquod exemplum in medio afferamus, in elargitionibus *regiis* et *pontificiis,* quarum profecto elargitionum veri auctores sunt Rex et R. P.—qui enim per alium facit per seipsum facere videtur—et nihilominus eleemosynas erogandas apud se minime detinent.

Nec opus est ut quis eleemosynas erogandas apud se retineat, etiamsi *directe,* idest per semetipsum, eas erogare velit. Nihil enim impedit quominus eleemosynae erogandae apud alium deponi valeant, ex. gr. apud oeconomum, a quo parochus, quotiescumque necessitas postulaverit, eam eleemosynarum quantitatem sibi tradere faciat, quam ipse, pro prudenti suo arbitrio, erogandam esse judicat. Quisquis igitur eleemosynas erogare potest, quin opus sit eas apud se retinere.

(e) Prima pars paragraphi 4 can. 630 est affirmativa, altera vero negativa. In illa declaratur quid parochus religiosus facere potest relate ad eleemosynas, quae offeruntur *in bonum paroecianorum, vel pro scholis catholicis aut locis piis paroeciae coniunctis.* In hac vero expresse edicitur nihil fieri posse a parocho relate ad eleemosynas oblatas *pro ecclesia paroeciali aedificanda, conservanda, instauranda, exornanda.*

Ad III. *Negative.* In primis parochus religiosus nullo modo administrare potest *eleemosynas pro ecclesia paroeciali aedificanda, conservanda, instauranda, exornanda;* quia huiusmodi eleemosynas *administrare,* sicut eas *accipere, apud se*

[4] Vermeersch, 1, p. 329.

retinere, colligere pertinet ad Superiores, inter quos venit localis,[5] sub conditione: *si ecclesia sit communitatis religiosae* (Can. 630, 4°).

Relate ad bona, seu eleemosynas, quae offeruntur *in bonum paroecianorum, vel pro scholis catholicis aut locis piis paroeciae coniunctis,* parochus regularis potest quidem eas administrare, sed *servata* offerentium *voluntate et salva semper vigilantia sui Superioris,* uti evidenter constat ex prima parte paragraphi 4 Can. 630. Atqui administratio, quae cuivis conditioni sit subjecta, non potest esse *plena,* seu absoluta; quippe plena administratio, uti ipsum adjectivum designat, illa est quae nulla conditione nulloque limite afficitur. Ergo plena bonorum paroeciae administratio ad parochum religiosum minime spectat.

Ad IV. *Negative.* De eleemosynis oblatis pro *ecclesia paroeciali aedificanda, conservanda, instauranda, exornanda,* expedita res est. Nam ejusmodi eleemosynas "apud se retinere", sicut eas *accipere, colligere* aut administrare, uti expresse declarat can. 630, 4, pertinet ad Superiores.

Quoad eleemosynas oblatas in *bonum paroecianorum, vel pro scholis catholicis aut locis piis paroeciae coniunctis,* pariter affirmandum est parochum religiosum non posse tales eleemosynas "apud se retinere", et ratio evidenter profluit ex dictis.

In tradenta solutione II quaesiti notavimus primam partem paragraphi 4 Can. 630, ubi agitur de eleemosynis oblatis in bonum paroecianorum etc., esse affirmativam. Hinc quidquid in ea exprimitur parochus religiosus facere potest, quod vero non exprimitur facere non potest. Cum igitur in prima parte paragraphi 4 Can. 630, verba "apud se retinere" haud expressa inveniantur, inferendum est parochum religiosum non posse "apud se retinere" eleemosynas oblatas in *bonum paroecianorum* etc.

Nec dici potest praefata verba "apud se retinere" esse subintelligenda, quia parochus religiosus habet a Jure generalem facultatem *administrandi, erogandi . . . eleemosynas quovis modo oblatas in bonum* paroecianorum etc. Siquidem, uti supra dictum est, quisquis optime exercere valet munus administratoris absque munere oeconomi et vicissim; sicut accidit fere

[5] Blat, p. 702.

in omnibus domibus religiosis, in quibus utrumque munus distinctum habet titularem.

Notavimus quoque elargitionem, erogationem eleemosynarum perfecte consistere posse absque earumdem apud se detentione. Itaque cum eleemosynae possint administrari atque erogari quin apud se retineantur, verba "apud se retinere" in canone subintelligi nequeunt. Ex eo igitur quod parochus religiosus habeat a Jure generalem facultatem administrandi, erogandi eleemosynas oblatas in bonum paroecianorum etc. inferri nullatenus potest ipsum habere quoque facultatem easdem eleemosynas apud se retinendi.

Praeterea, iuxta eumdem Can. 630, 1, religiosus, qui paroeciam regit sive titulo parochi sive titulo vicarii, manet adstrictus ad observantiam votorum et Constitutionem compatibilem cum suo munere. Atqui deponere eleemosynas apud oeconomum conventus cum officio parochi, uti cuique patet, est quammaxime compatibilis. Ergo parochus religiosus detinere nequit apud se pecuniam, seu eleemosynas oblatas in bonum paroecianorum etc.

Ex hucusque dictis concludimus:

1. Quia bonorum paroeciae administratio, *ex una parte* sub vigilantia Superioris exercenda est, *et ex alia parte* ad offerentium voluntatem attendatur oportet, ideo parochus religiosus plenam bonorum paroeciae administrationem sibi vindicare nequit;

2. Attentis duobus paragraphis, nempe 1° et 4° Can. 630, parocho religioso nullum jus inest retinendi apud se pecuniam, quae a paroecia provenit.

FR. IVO VITALI, O.F.M.

THE CHURCH AND RURAL LIFE PROBLEMS IN THE MIDWEST.

The American rural problem discussed from the pastoral aspect in the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW calls for a study of farming conditions in important districts. In most of the Mississippi Valley States, farming is the predominant occupation of the people. It represents 80% of the wealth in Iowa. Agriculture is the business of the people and the small towns are dependent on the farms about them. The farmer is the all-important individual in these States. If he prospers, the

town merchants are well off, and the people of the cities likewise make money. The welfare of the country people is the concern of all. It is also a concern of the Church, for their prosperity means financial support, and more vital still is the question of keeping the Catholic farmer on the farm. The loss of faith among country people is not notable, except through mixed marriages.

Farm life must be made attractive to the country people. To make it attractive it should be made profitable financially. The farm should bring good returns and then the greatest feature in making it attractive will prevail. If most of the rural people are making money, they are not going to leave the farm. This is our first and biggest problem. Few things have changed as much as the modern ways of conducting a farm. Great improvements have been made in the processes of manufacturing of steel and other products; modern transportation has made vast strides in bettering its ways of hauling produce; methods of imparting knowledge to the child in the school room have changed; gone are the days of old in almost every walk of life; but nowhere has greater improvement been made than in the methods of production on the farm. Science has become the handmaid of Agriculture. There were pioneers in the days of the covered wagon as it trundled its way over our prairies; now there are pioneers in the New Farm era. Not men in the hardy pioneer days, but men who have studied farming in the colleges, or are taught the new methods in the Agriculture College Extension Service, or are directed by the captains of the biggest industries to-day, the trained County Agents. The County Agent is the expert leader or director of the farm industry in the county which represents a valuation of over $50,000,000.

Now what is the new era in farming accomplishing? It is putting land into production that previously was too wet. This is the question of drainage. It is raising the yield per acre of grain. This is done by the Crop Rotation, growing legumes, using lime and phosphorus, better use of barnyard fertilizer. More profitable crops are raised, such as those that furnish protein food for the stock. Of greater importance is the change that has come in eliminating wholesale wastes on the farm from the scrub dairy cow, non-laying hens, poor breeds

of hogs and ways of feeding. These items mean millions of dollars annually to the farmers of one State. Now the part of the Church comes in here. It is necessary for the priest in the rural districts, I do not mean country parishes, but parishes that have a considerable number of farmers, to get behind this new movement for better farming and give it his support.

Many of our farmers are prejudiced against these new ways. They keep aloof from the Farm Bureau and think they know the last word on agriculture, while their ways are antiquated. Many of the pastors are not in much sympathy with the Farm Bureau. They make light of it or complain against it and so are undermining their own parishes. In Catholic European countries the priests are leaders in the parish organizations to promote better farming. This is most evident from Father O'Hara's report of his recent interesting trip abroad to study the farm question. Many of our fathers have their pet theories of political schemes to remedy the evils of the day and can orate on them, but that isn't the way to teach the farmers how profitably to feed a milch cow or tell a laying hen from one that should be put in the pot for the next Sunday dinner. How can a pastor live year after year among his farmers and never get interested in their material welfare and help them on the way to more profitable farming? Many do not know the fundamentals of the farm question, though short courses at the several agricultural colleges are conducted for the clergy. Any priest can encourage the parishioners to take up the improved ways of farming and work with the county agent in getting his members into the farm bureau. The farm bureau is a new organization and if county agents have sometimes made mistakes, why blame the whole idea? What new venture has not made mistakes? What manufacturing plant in introducing new methods of production did not make its errors?

There is nothing that will hold the growing generation on the farm like getting them into the ways of scientific farming. Then they will see that farming is not a back number and they can use their little portion of brains on the farm as well as in town running some gas station. The clubs formed for the country boys and girls are the best means of inducing the youths of the country to stay on the farms. See a boy in a calf club caring for his Holstein calf and getting it ready for

the contest at the county fair. Is he interested in the farm? Try to talk town to him and he will show you the gate. The girls' clubs study a six-year course in home decorating, canning, and sewing. Every Four-H girl is a future lady in a farm home. Rural pastors can do wonders in getting their young people into these clubs and let them meet in the parish hall, as they often do in many places where there are country churches. Catholics are loath to enter into any enterprise unless their pastor sanctions it and gives his approval. A word of encouragement from the pastor will give impetus to the boys and girls to join the clubs. This popularizes farming in their estimation and holds them out of the towns. They like to have a little study added to their farm life, and to know it is an intellectual occupation. In Iowa, the Agriculture College puts on a special week's program for them between Christmas and New Year when they have school vacation at home. Going to Ames they see the college and its work, the teaching of scientific farming, and it awakens in their minds a desire to study the deeper problems of farmer's work. No pastor need worry anything about the religious side of this club work. These youngsters are encouraged to attend the church to which they belong as the right thing to do. Religion does not enter at all into the club work, so there is the best of feeling. The men and women at the head of the movement are broadminded cultured people who are in it to help the coming generation of farmers.

The new era in farming is a great movement. Where are the Catholic men and women represented in it? Every county has its organization under the State organization. Then the township is the unit. Each township has its chairman and each rural school district its co-operator. Now these leaders in each county, township, or school district, are the leading farmers in the community, or leading workers in a progressive work. The active boys and girls in the club work are going to be the future farm leaders. Now in the whole movement where are the representative Catholics? We are not taking the part we should as Catholics in this great movement. We are standing back and others are taking the lead. In Catholic countries the priests are the leaders. This movement for the uplift of the farm situation is the biggest thing in America to-day. The

farm wealth is seventy-eight billion dollars. No other industry has so much capital and one-third of the population in its occupation. Why should not the Catholics take a part in the work? How many Catholic young men are taking the farm courses? They are a small minority. Most of our Catholic boys go into the professions and want to be lawyers or doctors. A good county agent can have a salary of $3,500 to $4,000 a year and traveling expenses paid and a secretary in his office. Not a bad line of work to engage in. Catholic leadership is wanting in the farm movement.

Farming should be taught as a branch in all schools attended by country children, whether it be the rural school, the village high school, or the parochial school. It is to be the life's occupation of the child, and why should he not study it in the school? Is there not as much culture or mental development in studying how a hill of corn grows as there is in studying about fractions or the battles of the Civil War? Would not a little scientific knowledge of soil fertility be more advantageous to the country child than some of the supposed up-to-date subjects they are studying to-day in our schools? If the boys and girls in the country study agriculture in the schools and get the intellectual habit on the farm, you will not see 10,000 rural youths leaving the farm each year and going into Des Moines, Iowa, and other towns in the same proportion. There will be some future for the country parish, and it will not be dying out as some are now. Our parochial schools in the country parishes should take up the study of agriculture if the young are to be kept on the farms. Let the country church be conducted for country needs and the country school educate for the wants of country life, and the country parish will grow.

To do this we must have country pastors in sympathy with country life. Here is the crux of the problem. Too many country parishes are stepping-stones to higher things—town parishes. The pastor lives as in exile from his native land, and never enters into the spirit of the parishioners, who are there to stay, we hope. The training for the country parish has to start back in the seminary. I spoke to a college graduate who was raised on a farm, and was soon to start for the seminary, about his interest in the country-life problem. It

was an appeal to deaf ears. Already the college had converted him to the city idea. We are not conscious of the great fact that there is a vast difference in the conducting of a city and a country parish; that the training for the one is different from that for the other. We are pleased to see the interest now taken in some of the seminaries in rural problems. During the vacation time the candidate for the priesthood might gather much valuable knowledge and experience by teaching vacation schools, acting as scout leaders and working with club boys and girls, attending farm bureau meetings and project demonstrations, or attending the short courses given to rural clergy during the summertime, as is done at Madison, Wisconsin, and Ames, Iowa. The Protestant clergy are far more active than we, in attending these short courses. Some of them are paid to come by their bishops. The one or three-week courses tell the clergy about the fundamentals of the farm problems, so he can act intelligently in leading his people in the movement. Then they create a sympathy for the projects and get the clergy behind the better farm problem.

PASTOR RURICOLA.

CASUS RESTITUTIONIS?

Qu. Some few years ago, two men bought a piece of land in the Middle West. One of them fell ill and made a will that gave all his property to his partner, but he told him that the proceeds of his share of the land, whenever it should be sold, was to be used to establish a home for old people, under the direction of Sisters. A few years after his death, the land was sold for a town-site for a very good price. The surviving partner took the money, invested it in good securities and used the money for himself. To salve his conscience, he gave a substantial sum for a new church that was erected in his parish, but got the credit for it. Now as old age warns him that his days are counted and as he has ample means for his modest needs, he realizes that he did not fulfil the wishes of his partner who died many years ago. So he wants to know what he is obliged to do about it. The will was perfectly legal and gave him his partner's share of the property: as far as the law is concerned, he is perfectly safe. When consulted, my answer was what all theologians say, that "testamentum ad causas pias valet etiamsi forma juridica valeat". He was not in good faith as he asked the question and I could not in conscience give another answer. It was pretty hard on the old man: so we agreed to submit the question to others.

Is it possible to exempt this man from the obligation of using that money for the purpose intended by the partner who is dead?

If the answer is in the negative, is he obliged to spend for that purpose all the interest collected in those years?

As the interest was reinvested, is he obliged also to spend compound interest since the property was sold? If he refuses, can he be absolved?

Resp. The "locus classicus" for the solution of difficulties like the one proposed is the reply of the S. Penitentiary, 23 June, 1844, which has already found a place in the REVIEW (Vol. XX. 61). "Eudorius, an unmarried man, without any necessary heirs, when gravely ill determined to devote part of his goods to pious works, in order to provide for his soul. With this in view, he constituted Boniface his sole heir, by a will drawn up in legal form. He, however, delivered to Boniface a private document, in which he made known his pious desire, and besought him to carry it out faithfully. On the death of Eudorius, Boniface kept the whole estate, on the ground that it was his by a valid will. Can he safely do this in conscience?" The S. Penitentiary replied: "In the proposed case, Boniface is bound in conscience to fulfil the wish of Eudorius, certainly known to him, in the domain of conscience."

This has been the consistent attitude of the Church (Canon 1513.2). While recognizing the power of the civil law, which may annul bequests for profane purposes, the Church claims jurisdiction over bequests for pious purposes, and demands only that the requirements of the natural and Canon law be fulfilled; viz., that the will of the deceased be certainly known to the individual, either by writing, by the testimony of at least two trustworthy persons, or by an oral communication to himself.

The surviving partner is certain of the will of the deceased; he bound himself by a "contractus innominatus" to carry out his desire, and by his acceptance of the trust prevented the deceased from taking other means to have his wishes fulfilled.

The sum that was contributed toward the erection of a church did not extinguish the obligation, which was not a general one, to devote the proceeds of the land to pious purposes, but a definite and specific one, to erect a home for the aged.

The amount of money which he is bound to devote to the purpose prescribed is the original sum with the civil fruits, i. e., with the interest at the current rate, compounded annually.

The proper procedure would be to refer the case to the Ordinary who has jurisdiction over all pious bequests (Can. 1515), and secure from him, or from the Holy See through him, a composition, in accordance with Canon 1517.

Answering the questions as proposed: first, it is not within the powers of a pastor or confessor to exempt him from the obligation of using the money for the purpose intended. Secondly, he is obliged to spend for that purpose the sum with compound interest at the current (not the legal) rate of interest. Thirdly, he is not obliged to spend the extraordinary returns he secured from reinvesting the interest, if this is due to his own business acumen.

If he refuses to promise to take the action recommended by his confessor, he cannot be absolved, since he is not in good faith and is admittedly a possessor in bad faith.

SALE OF INDULGENCED OBJECTS.

Qu. One of my parishioners who died last winter left in his estate some valuable relics which he had collected in his travels abroad. Recently the furnishings of his residence were sold at auction by the heirs. A friend of the family, mainly Protestants in its membership, knowing that there had been in the possession of the deceased (who was a convert) a large indulgenced crucifix, brought from the Holy Land, attended the sale. As he had suspected the pictures and other religious objects were among the things to be auctioned off, and as they went at a rather low bid, the friend bought most of them, mainly to prevent their being desecrated through ignorance of their devotional nature. The cross was among the objects sold. On examining it the purchaser found a label on the back stating whence the crucifix came and mentioning the indulgences. The canon law seems to imply that indulgenced objects when sold lose their indulgences. My friend is in doubt whether he gains the spiritual privileges indicated on the back of the cross. Is that correct?

Resp. The Church law (Can. 924 n. 2) does indeed state that the indulgences attached to objects are forfeited when the latter are made the subject of sale. "Indulgentiae coronis

aliisve rebus adnexae tunc cessant cum coronae aliaeve res prorsus desinant esse, vel vendantur."

But it is quite evident from the tenor of the canon, which revokes a former restriction of Pope Benedict XV, that the expression "cum vendantur" is intended to bear the meaning of "when sold with the intent of trafficking in the indulgenced object". In the above-mentioned case neither the auctioneer, nor the original owners and heirs, nor the purchaser had any such sinister purpose in mind. The act of sale is a transfer of the object, with compensation for the material value of the object and without reference to the indulgence, or even knowledge of it. Accordingly the article would seem to retain its spiritual value without loss by the transfer.

RESIGNATION OF THE PASTORAL CHARGE.

Qu. Some time ago the pastor of a small parish, about whose neglect of instruction and of sick-calls there have been complaints, was informed that, since illness apparently incapacitated him, the Ordinary would send an assistant to supply the deficiency of parochial service. He thereupon wrote a letter to the bishop stating that the parish was incapable of supporting two priests and that rather than have an assistant he would resign his charge.

The bishop did not answer at once, as he did not know where to place the pastor who, though there is no complaint against his character, suffers from nervous debility, which makes him irritable and apparenly oversensitive about any exertion apart from saying the Sunday Mass.

After a time a substitute was appointed and the pastor was told that he might take a vacation until suitable arrangements could be made to give him a chaplaincy that would entail no strain on his strength.

Now the priest wishes to withdraw his resignation, offering to take a vacation with the prospect of resuming full charge of the parish, if the bishop will withdraw the substitute after his return. The bishop has no confidence in the prospective improvement and proposes to maintain the removal of the pastor. Could the latter according to canon law vindicate his refusal to accept the change by making a protest and withdrawing the resignation?

Resp. Not if the priest made his protest after the Ordinary had formally accepted the resignation. The latter stands,

once definitely made, and it allows the bishop to act upon it at his discretion. It may be withdrawn any time before it is formally accepted (Cf. Can. 189 n. 2 and 191 n. 1; also *Jus Pont.*, 1922, pp. 85-6).

THE "MISSA PRO POPULO" IN A VACANT PARISH.

Qu. My neighbor died and the archbishop notified me to take charge of the parish until he could appoint a successor. I sent my assistant there to say the parochial Mass on Sunday. Was he obliged to offer one Mass *pro populo,* if he had to say two Masses, one here and one there?

Resp. The obligation of saying the Mass "pro populo" devolves upon the pastor. If the latter happens to have charge of two parishes, the one Mass, said by him or at his instance, if he be prevented, includes all the people under his care. Hence there is no obligation on the part of the assistant to offer the Mass of administration especially "pro populo", whether he says one or two Masses. The case is the same as that of a substitute or "vicarius oeconomus".

"Vicarius oeconomus qui plures paroecias tempore vacationis regit, potest, ad normam can. 473 n. 1 collati cum can. 466 n. 2 unam tantum Missam pro populis sibi commissis diebus praescriptis applicari" (Pont. Commissio, 14 July, 1922).

TRANSFER OF STATIONS OF THE CROSS.

Qu. When the Stations of the Cross canonically erected are, owing to the destruction of the church, placed in a new church, in the same parish, but ten blocks away from the old site, must they be blessed again, or will it do for the parish priest or one of the assistants to have them put up on the wall of the new church?

S. BARBARA.

Resp. The title of erection granted by a special faculty remains and hence need not be newly applied for; but the act of erection, with the prescribed form of the ritual by which the stations are placed on the walls, has to be renewed, and recorded. This is required because the indulgence is attached to a definite locality rather than to a parish title, although the application for it is made in the name of the parish.

POPULARIZING THE NUPTIAL MASS.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Would you kindly insert the following timely suggestion in the REVIEW? I consider it useful, first on account of the contents or text of the Nuptial Mass itself, and secondly owing to the present "Liturgical Movement" and the great want of a keener appreciation of the sacredness of the Holy Sacrament of Matrimony.

We are encouraging our good Catholic people to use the Missal in English (the English translation of it or any other for that matter), and rightly so. I need not dwell on the obvious advantages of this practice.

If it is recommendable in general to use the official prayer book of the Church at any time, why not hand our *young people to be married* a good translation of the most beautiful Nuptial Mass on the morning of their wedding? It is a pity to see the young couple just married assisting at that Mass left to their own resources, while the priest himself is reading what must be considered one of the most beautifully conceived Masses of the whole Missal. The "happy couple" as well as the witnesses often come without a prayer book or even beads and yet it is one of the most important days of their lives! The suggestion then is this:

Let each pastor have half a dozen or a dozen copies (according to the size of the parish) of a good English translation of the Nuptial Mass or at least its principal characteristic parts and hand them over for use to the bride, the bridegroom and *the witnesses* just before Holy Mass starts, or have the servers do so. The copies should have a stiff binding so as to last; the print must be good, and above all things the text is to be couched in good, popular yet solemn language so as to be easily understood and appreciated. I feel sure our flocks would be grateful for it. The booklets are to be kept in the sacristy and can be used over and over again even by friends and relatives, often Protestants. Several dozen copies might be ordered.

Any Catholic publishing firm could turn out this booklet at a low price having provided itself with a good, simple translation with ecclesiastical sanction. It should be the best pos-

sible text to be got and give not less than the Epistle, the Gospel, the superb, classical, awe-inspiring two prayers after the Pater noster, which bring out the great honor conferred on the married couple in being made "co-creators" with God of the human race and its consequent heavy responsibility, and the final blessing after the "Benedicamus Domino" or the "Ite missa est" respectively.

The writer has heen working in different climes and felt the want of this popularized form of the stately Nuptial Mass everywhere.

Let the editor and readers have "their say" and the suggestion be regularly discussed in the columns of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

K. WOHLFAHRT.

St. Paul, Minnesota.

REOENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS.

23 April, 1926: Monsignori Francis J. Conaty, John J. Clifford, and George Donahoe, of the Diocese of Los Angeles, Private Chamberlains (*supernumerarii*) of His Holiness.

PLAOE OF GOULD-OASTELLANE MARRIAGE.

For the sake of accuracy it should be pointed out that the marriage of Count Boni de Castellane to Anna Gould took place in the Gould mansion at Forty-Seventh Street and Fifth Avenue, New York, and not in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, as stated in the July issue (p. 80).

Ecclesiastical Library Table

RECENT THEOLOGY.

A scholarly article on the historical development of the dogma of the Holy Trinity, by the Rev. William Moran, D.D., appears in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for January. This great mystery of the Triune God, the writer tells us, revealed in the pages of the New Testament, appears consistently in the writings of the apostolic and of the sub-apostolic Fathers. However, only toward the middle of the second century was an attempt made to expound and defend the dogma in a systematic way. The occasion was furnished by the heresy of Monarchianism, which denied the plurality of persons in God. In their efforts to refute this error, some of the early writers—for example, Tertullian—used expressions that savored of the denial of the consubstantiality of the Three Divine Persons. By the end of the third century the real distinction of Persons in God had been placed beyond question; the divinity of each was expressly taught. It was then, however, that Arius appeared on the scene, and originated a heresy that denied the identity of the substance of the Three Persons. Arius gained a considerable following; nevertheless, the Church remained firm to the principles of revelation. The long and bitter struggle that followed resulted in a great clarification of ideas. St. Augustine recognized that the Divine Persons are distinguished by opposition of relation. Although the Schoolmen elaborated these principles, it may truly be said that St. Augustine has brought us as near to an understanding of this sublime mystery as we are ever likely to come this side of the grave.

An historical account of the Feast of the Assumption, contributed by the Rev. B. Capelle, O.S.B., to the *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* for January, is of interest in connexion with the much disputed question of the definability of Our Lady's corporeal assumption. In the Oriental Church, this feast—under the title of *Dormitio B. V. Mariae*—was assigned to 15 August by a decree of the Emperor Mauritius about the year 600. Half a century later, we find it observed in Rome as the *Assumptio Mariae*. The history of the Feast

in Gaul, however, is especially noteworthy. There from the beginning of the sixth century, a feast in honor of Our Lady was celebrated on 18 January. Toward the close of that century, the object of this feast was specifically Mary's *Dormitio*. About a century later the title of the feast was changed to Assumptio; and shortly afterward, the date was transferred to 15 August, in conformity with the Roman liturgy. The choice of these widely separated dates Fr. Capelle attributes to a statement in one of the apocryphal Gospels, that Mary's glorification occurred 206 days after her death. Originally, he thinks, both the death and the assumption of the Blessed Virgin were celebrated on 18 January in the East, whence the feast passed to the Church of Gaul. Later, as a result of the aforesaid Gospel narrative, Mary's Assumption was honored by a special feast on 15 August—206 days after 18 January according to the Coptic calendar. Gradually, the Assumption eclipsed the Death, and finally the feast of the *Dormitio* was abrogated.

The early Church regarded Mary's Assumption as a logical consequence of her perfect virginity. This is the reason, Fr. Capelle tells us, why the Gospel usually read at that time on feasts of virgins—the narrative of Martha and Mary—was chosen for the Mass of the Assumption. The idea of the connexion between Our Lady's virginity and her bodily glorification was derived from the writings of a certain Leucius who lived about the middle of the second century. He was an adherent of the Encratite heresy, yet it is not impossible that in this particular point he gave testimony to a truth that may furnish the theological basis for a definition by the Church of Mary's Assumption.

An article on "The Sacraments in the Chronicle of Arbela" is contributed by Fr. J. Umberg, S.J., to the fourth number of the *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* for 1925. Arbela, an ancient city of Asia Minor, was constituted an episcopal see about the beginning of the second century. The *Chronicle*, a history of this church and of its bishops, written in Syrian about the year 550, was brought to light a few years ago. It is of special value from a theological standpoint because it furnishes an authentic and fairly complete account of ecclesiastical discipline in the East from the second to the sixth

century. For example, we know from this record that the form of Baptism in the second century contained the separate invocation of the Three Divine Persons, just as at the present day. Moreover, certain expressions imply the practice of infant Baptism.

In reference to the Sacrament of Holy Orders the Chronicle provides information of particular interest. Before the middle of the second century only two grades of the hierarchy of Orders are mentioned—the episcopate and the diaconate. It was only during the administration of the fourth bishop (163-179) that the priesthood appears as a distinct order. These facts add considerable weight to the opinion, favored by a number of good theologians—e. g. Gasparri (*De Sacra Ordinatione,* I, n. 24)—that in the primitive church the priesthood in its fulness—i. e. as including the episcopal power—was conferred immediately on deacons; and that it was only in the second century that the priesthood as we understand it began to exist as a distinct order.

Fr. Umberg also writes in the first number of the *Zeitschrift* for 1926, on "The Essential Words of the Mass." He enumerates various opinions that have been held on this subject. Recently, Alfons Freericks in his book *The Eucharistic Sacrifice* (*Das Eucharistische Opfer*) distinguishes between what is essential for the *Sacrament* and what is necessary for the *Sacrifice.* Besides the words of consecration, he holds, the Sacrifice requires a *prayer*—some verbal expression of the sacrificial purpose of the rite. This prayer he finds in the Preface and in the Canon. Others, as Fr. de la Taille (*Mysterium Fidei,* Elucid. 35.), teach that the narrative preceding the words of consecration ("Qui pridie . . . Simili modo" etc.) is also essential, in order to make manifest that the priest is speaking in the name of Christ. The same eminent theologian also holds that the clause "qui pro vobis" etc. in the consecration of the chalice is necessary for validity. Fr. Umberg defends the more common view, that the Sacrifice is essentially perfected by the consecration, and that for the valid consecration the words, "Hoc est corpus meum," "Hic set sanguis meus", are sufficient. Besides intrinsic reasons, he quotes in favor of this opinion the Acts of the Provincial Council of the Maronites (an. 1736) which were approved by Popes Benedict XIV and Clement XIII.

A thesis on the ceremony of the imposition of hands, written for a Louvain doctorate by the Rev. J. Coppens, has recently been published. Fr. Coppens divides the various Christian rites accompanied by the imposition of hands into five classes—blessing, healing, Ordination, Confirmation, reconciliation. He gives the history of each, and refutes those who claim that the imposition of hands was derived from pagan sources. This ceremony, he shows, which is fundamentally a natural sign of imparting some spiritual favor, was in vogue among the Jews and was employed by our Lord Himself. In treating of Confirmation and Holy Orders, Fr. Coppens leans to the opinion that the matter of these Sacraments was specifically determined by Christ, yet he attributes to these rites an historical development that implies an essential alteration of their constituent elements by the authority of the Church.

A timely article entitled "The Indissolubility of Christian Marriage" from the pen of the Rev. Vincent Hanly, appears in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for February. The writer first examines the testimony of Christian tradition regarding the stability of the marital bond. An impartial investigation reveals that the early Church, both Eastern and Western, unanimously believed that a consummated Christian marriage cannot, for any reason whatsoever, be dissolved. Later on, under the pressure of political influence, especially in the East, a few theologians and local councils taught the liceity of divorce, even in the case of *matrimonium ratum et consummatum,* under certain circumstances. This doctrine, however, never became common, except in the East. Throughout the greater part of the Western Church, and especially in Rome, the correct principles constantly prevailed.

Fr. Hanly then examines the Scriptural doctrine on this point, particularly the text in which the Divine Legislator seems to allow divorce in the case of conjugal infidelity: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery." (Matt. 19:9). Departing from the usual explanation—that the phrase "except it be for fornication" refers to a mere separation and not to a complete divorce—Fr. Hanly offers an interpretation which both hermeneutically and theologically is very plausible. The words of Christ refer, he says, not to

Christian marriage but to the matrimonial laws of the Mosaic Code. There were among the Jews two conflicting doctrines regarding the grounds required for the bill of divorce which was permitted by Moses. (Deut. 24:1). The disciples of Shammai allowed the dissolution of the marital bond only on account of adultery, while the followers of Hillel taught that many lesser reasons sufficed. The question put by the Pharisees was: "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for *every* cause?" (v. 3). In other words, "Is the doctrine of Hillel correct?" Our Lord's answer favored the teaching of Shammai: "It is not lawful to give a bill of divorce, except in case of adultery." The doctrine of Christ concerning Christian marriage, given afterward to the disciples and related by the other Synoptics, admits of no exception: "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her" (Mark 10:11; vide Luke 16:18). Therefore, the text of Matthew is not, as is usually stated, parallel with those of Mark and Luke, but rather must be taken in conjunction with them to form the complete narrative. Fr. Hanly explains in a somewhat similar way the text of the Sermon on the Mount, where a like difficulty occurs.

Fr. David Barry, in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for May, discusses from both the dogmatic and the moral standpoint the subject of "Sacramental Penance." He thinks that many confessors impose penances in a stereotyped manner, taking into account only the difference between mortal and venial sin, without considering the particular needs of the individual penitent. Such a practice contributes little toward attaining the ends for which sacramental satisfaction is intended—reparation for the past, and protection against future transgressions. The penance should be adapted, Fr. Barry says, to the special weaknesses of the penitent. For example, he suggests that one who has been guilty of avarice be directed to have a Mass applied for his intention; and thus he will have the benefit of a twofold satisfactory work—almsgiving and prayer. Moreover, as far as possible, the penance should be proportioned to the number and the gravity of the sins, so that he who has committed two mortal sins should ordinarily receive a more serious penance than he who has only one. Fr. Barry suggests that confessors occasionally give their peni-

tents some idea of the ancient discipline of the Church to help them realize the malice of sin and the importance of making condign satisfaction.

A second edition of Fr. De Smet's book on the Sacraments in General, Baptism, and Confirmation has recently been published. The author considers both the dogmatic and the moral aspects of the Sacraments. Like many present-day theologians, he favors the view that Christ did not determine specifically the matter and the form of all the Sacraments, but in regard to certain ones gave to the Church some power of choosing the elements requisite for validity. Fr. De Smet even allows the application of this theory to the form of Baptism, so that it could be held that at one time this Sacrament was administered "in nomine Patris," etc. without "Ego te baptizo." Even at the present day, he says, the omission of *te* (or any equivalent mention of the subject) would not invalidate the Baptism. He thinks it possible that the faithful of the early Church were unconscious of the sacramental nature of certain rites which Christ had instituted as Sacraments (for example, Matrimony); and that only gradually the knowledge of the true character of these rites evolved. He proposes the hypothesis that some of the Sacraments were not used by the Church until a number of years after the beginning of the Christian era. Regarding the efficacy of the Sacraments, Fr. De Smet favors the theory of intentional causality.

In the *Gregorianum* for March, Fr. de la Taille, S.J., (commenting on a recent work by Dr. A. Landgraf) propounds St. Thomas's doctrine of the nature of venial sin. The basis of the Angelic Doctor's teaching on this subject is the principle that man is obliged to direct every human act to God. Accordingly, there are no individual acts that are morally indifferent—for every act directed to God is good; every act not directed to Him is bad. The just man is obliged to direct his acts by the virtue of charity; the sinner and the unbeliever can direct them by lower (but morally good) motives. Every act *against* God is a mortal sin. An act, however, which is not against God (i. e. not opposed to the love which the creature owes Him), but is not directed to Him, is a venial sin. It may lack this required direction either subjectively—i. e. because the agent neglects to refer it to God—or objectively,

because by its nature it is incapable of such direction—e. g. falsehood. It may be asked, what is the *ultimus finis* of such an act, since it is neither for God nor against Him. The answer is, that such an act has for its final goal the beatitude *in abstracto* of the agent. From this follows the doctrine of St. Thomas that one whose intellect intuitively beholds the identity of beatitude *in abstracto* and God—for example, the angels and our first parents—cannot commit a sin that is merely venial. For, if he neglects to direct any act to God, he cannot direct it to his own beatitude *in abstracto;* therefore, it must have as its *ultimus finis* some creature, and thus be a mortal sin.

Writing in the *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* for April on *Venial Sin and Imperfection,* Fr. E. Ranwez defends a rather severe doctrine. It is a venial sin, he says, for a person to choose deliberately what he knows is for him the less perfect of two possible courses of action, even though in itself that course contains nothing wrong, and the opposite *per se* is not obligatory. For, he argues, it is unreasonable to choose what is less advantageous to one's soul when the choice of the more advantageous is possible; but it is sinful to do what is unreasonable. An imperfection in the strict sense—i. e. one that is free from all culpability—Fr. Ranwez asserts, is committed only when a person is undecided as to which is for him the more perfect course, and in this state of doubt chooses that which objectively is the less perfect.

It is consoling to note that so reliable a theological authority as Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., in *La Vie Spirituelle* for January, 1925, takes a more lenient view, and teaches that to choose, even with full knowledge and deliberation, the less perfect of two good courses, while it may be designated as an imperfection, is not in itself a sin.

Several European Catholic periodicals are manifesting a deep inerest in the recent efforts among Protestant denominations to effect a reunion of Christianity. The *Civiltà Cattolica,* in its issues for 20 March and 3 April gives an excellent account of the movement for reunion in the Anglican Church. Many Anglicans entertain an earnest hope of uniting with the Greek Orthodox Church. To this end, Bishop Gore and about 4000 members of the "Catholic" party recently signed a

"Declaration of Faith," professing belief in the seven Sacraments, the Real Presence, the veneration of the Saints, and other doctrines held by the Orthodox Church. The Rev. J. Hood, a prominent Anglican divine, states in his book *English Catholicism and the Roman See* that the reunion of all "non-papal Catholics" of the world is already in sight.

Other well-disposed Anglicans ardently desire union with the Roman Church. They seem unable, however, to grasp the Catholic idea of the Primacy and of papal infallibility. Lord Halifax, the protagonist of this party, in his recent work, *Reunion and the Roman Primacy,* defends the opinion that the infallibility of the Pope is dependent on the consent of the Church.

An editorial entitled *"Eastward Ho!"* in the *Tablet* for 3 April states that a union of the Anglican with the Orthodox Church is utterly out of the question. For the "Catholic" party in the English Church is in the minority; the bulk of Anglicans are either evangelicals or modernists. It would be impossible to induce these, who are so radically Protestant or materialistic, to accept Orthodoxy with its seven Sacraments, its cult of the Blessed Virgin, and its elaborate ritual.

Writing in the *Month* for April on the subject of "Corporate Reunion and Continuity," Fr. Keating, S.J., very logically argues against those who hope for the return of the Anglican Church in a body: "No Catholic priest could reconcile a congregation *en masse;* before admitting anyone to membership of the Church, the priest would have to find out whether he was validly baptized or not, and generally to baptize him *sub conditione.* Even before this individual act, he would have to ascertain whether he held the whole faith. . . . However numerous the applicants for admission, they could enter only one by one into the Fold. Narrow, in that sense, is the gate which leads to life." The same writer also emphasizes the fact that the Anglican Church began under Elizabeth, and not under Henry VIII. The revolt of the latter was a schism rather than a heresy. Hence, those Anglicans who try to defend the connexion of their Church with the pre-Reformation English Church by contending that Henry did not establish a new religion are arguing beside the point.

The *Month* for January and the *Civiltà Cattolica* for 20 February contain interesting accounts of the so-called "*Universal Christian Conference*" held in Stockholm during August, 1925. Representatives of thirty-one non-Catholic denominations were present at that assembly—among them several Oriental bishops. Although a great many noble principles were enunciated in regard to Christian unity, it was found impossible to formulate a creed to which all would subscribe. An interdenominational Lord's Supper was planned, but had to be abandoned because of the protests of Anglicans and Orientals. The delegates seem to have left the Congress without having shed or received much light on the means necessary to effect the desired union.

The *Civiltà* takes occasion of this event to warn Catholic writers not to use expressions such as "union of the churches," nor to express a desire for the "union of the Church." Such phrases imply that the Church of Christ is not necessarily one, or that the true Church has lost its unity. What we should ardently hope for is, as it is expressed in the Litany, that God may recall to the unity of the Church all those who are in error.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Esopus, N. Y.

Criticisms and Notes

MYSTICAL PHENOMENA. Compared with Their Human and Diabolical Counterfeits. A Treatise on Mystical Theology in Agreement with the Principle of St. Teresa set forth by the Carmelite Congress of 1923 at Madrid. By Mgr. Albert Farges, Ph.D., Laureate of the French Academy, former Director of Saint-Sulpice and of the Institut Catholique of Paris. Translated from the Second French Edition by S. P. Jaques. Benziger Brothers: New York. 1926. Pp. 668.

Monsignor Farges is best known to students of philosophy in the first place through his two solid and timely manuals in Latin and French wherein with his colleague Fr. Barbedette he has exhibited Scholastic Philosophy in its relations with the modern sciences; and in the second place through his *Études Philosophiques,* a decade of volumes—each of which has seen multiplied editions—whereby he has sought to make that philosophy more popular, that is, more intelligible to modern habits of thought. In the book at hand are comprised his lectures delivered during a period of seven years (1899-1908) at the University Seminary of Angers, of which institution he is the founder and first rector. The work on its own plane reflects the spirit that pervades the contributions to philosophy just mentioned, that is, an endeavor to penetrate to the root principles, the essence, of the subject and then to follow up the outcome, the properties, thereof. Hence the matter falls under two headings: (1) the essential constituents of the mystical life, and (2) the accidental or marvelous phenomena and their natural or diabolical counterfeits.

The essence of the mystical life, Mgr. Farges finds to consist in the infused prayer of contemplation. This act or state he analyzes in its object, cause, effects, degrees and the preparatory steps and methods that lead to it—always supposing a divine call thereto; for Mgr. Farges vehemently insists that mystical union is not only essentially supernatural in its object and origin but necessarily presupposes God's free election. He therefore sets his face against those whose slogan is "mysticism for all". No one can be a genuine mystic simply because he wants to, nor merely through the exercise of asceticism, albeit both that desire and the practices of self-denial are preparations necessary thereto. Neither will he agree with those who would facilitate the whole matter by defining Mysticism as simply the love of God. With St. Thomas he maintains that union with God is primarily and essentially—even as is the beatific vision—an act or a state of the intellect. Mystical contemplation he holds "to consist in an *experimental sensation of the divine,* that is, in an

immediate intuition by the consciousness, more or less clear or obscure, of the *presence* in our souls of God or a supernatural object, the *essence* whereof remains unknown, which produces a sentiment of admiration and love, suspending more or less the powers of the soul."

It is thus discriminated from philosophical contemplation, which is of the order natural, while mystical is essentially supernatural. The former is produced by reasoning or intuitive effort of man's genius; the second is a gift of God and the product of his supernatural action in the soul of his choice; also it is common to the ignorant and the learned, whilst the former is the privilege of the learned only. Finally, the one is of a purely speculative order; the other finds its end in the love of God and in sacrifice. It is no longer only an exercise of the intelligence, but of holiness and union with God.

It is likewise differentiated from meditation and other forms of prayer which may prepare the way for its infusion. "Meditation seeks, contemplation has found; meditation aspires to enjoyment, contemplation enjoys; meditation is a laborious effort, contemplation is a repose; meditation is work with fruit, contemplation is fruit without labor; meditation reasons, contemplation sees intuitively; meditation and the prayer of simplicity are an abstract knowledge, contemplation is a concrete and experimental knowledge; meditation makes us think of the Divine Friend, contemplation makes us feel Him present and acting; meditation and the prayer of simplicity are the fruit of our industry, contemplation is passive; it is a gift of God which operates in us and without our help, if we are docile" (p. 58).

The second half of the book deals with the phenomena which may or may not—though they in one form or another usually do—accompany mystical experience. They are either of the cognitive or of the affective order. Of the former are visions of various kinds and revelations. Amongst the latter are ecstasy, stigmatization, levitation, various forms of effluvia, supernatural abstinence, empire over nature, etc. The mere mention of these terms suffices to suggest what a field is here opened out wherein self-deceit, delusive dreams, hallucinations, hysteria, hypnosis run riot and combine with or play into the hands of diabolism to ruin sanity of body as well as mind and to lead souls to eternal perdition. Needless to say, the treatment of these delicate and dangerous subjects demands wide knowledge of the facts, much experience with, and keen insight into the subtle working of the instinctive and unconscious forces of man's complex nature, together with a certain spiritual discernment which distinguishes clearly between influences which may come from grace or

from nature, or (who shall say how often?) immediately from Satan himself.

It is giving the book high praise to say that these qualities of discernment manifest themselves throughout the work. In dealing with the essentials of the mystical life the author keeps close of course to the teachings of the great masters—Saints Thomas, Teresa, John of the Cross, Francis de Sales—and other authorities adjudged so by the Church. For the mystical phenomena he appeals to the Bollandists, to the processes of canonizations and to well-authenticated hagiography. The appended Bibliography shows how reliable have been his sources of supply both for fact and for theory; for genuine and for imitative phenomena. Here and there a critical eye will detect an exaggeration in statement, as for instance that Dionysius the Carthusian wrote one hundred and fifty volumes concerning his raptures and apparitions (p. 27). One misses also too often the absence of precise reference to the sources of some of the marvelous phenomena adduced—an absence which is apt to weaken the confidence, especially of those who for one reason or another are chronically suspicious of the preternatural; a distrust which will not be allayed by an appeal to the Breviary as an authority in these matters (p. 537). On the other hand, such a lack of the use of the critical faculty as one meets with occasionally in so large a work makes little against the solid substance of the principal phenomena adduced and still less against the interpretations offered by the author to account for them. The book should be read by priests generally as well for their own guidance as for the exercise of their vocation of spiritual direction, particularly in religious communities. We know how greatly St. Teresa missed the guidance of a competent director; how it drew from her the cry, " For the love of Our Lord, I beg the Superior to maintain this holy liberty, and to get permanent leave from the bishop or provincial for the nuns to have, besides their ordinary confessors, *learned* priests to whom they may at all times speak and open their souls, especially if their own priests, though holy, are not great scholars. God forbid that the religious should be directed entirely by one priest if he is ill-instructed, however saintly his spirit may appear, and perhaps may be in reality. Learning gives great light on all points; it is combined with holiness in some men " (p. 12).

THE WORSHIP OF NATURE. By Sir James George Frazier, O.M., F.R.S., F.B.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Macmillan Co., New York. 1926. Pp. 672.

Were we looking for types whereby to illustrate a study in contrasts we would hit at once upon the book before us and place it over against the one reviewed above, *Mystical Phenomena.* The supreme experience of souls whom God, the Absolute Creator, chooses to lift up to intimate personal converse with Himself. This on one side. *The Worship of Nature,* the fanciful dreams, childish myths, bizarre customs wherewith the so-called primitives, savages, backward races (including in certain respects some civilized peoples), have sought to express their superstitious reverence or fear of natural forces and material objects which they personify and deify—the worship of the Sky, the Earth, the Sun. Behold the contrary. Intelligent union with the Creator in the one case—religion at its highest. The worship of figments projected by the ignorant, the degraded, the pagan imagination into the several realms of inanimate nature and adored and placated as veritable gods—religion at its lowest. However, we are not here called upon to undertake a study in contrasts. Enough to have noticed the alluring material offered by these two publications. The volume at present under notice embodies a large part of the lectures delivered by the distinguished author in 1924-25 at the University of Edinburgh on the Gifford foundation—a lectureship devised to promote studies connected with or germane to Theodicy.

Whether or not Animism expresses man's earliest attempt to solve the riddle of the universe, our author confesses himself unable to decide (p. 6). On the other hand, the theory that it stands for the most primitive form of religious worship is fundamental to his philosophy. Early man appears to have begun, he thinks, by peopling universal nature with sprites, genii, gods. Every rock and hill, every tree and flower, every brook and river, "every breeze that blew and every cloud that flecked with silvery white the blue expanse of heaven", was a seat or throne of some spirit or deity to be honored or propitiated. This was Animism. Later, moved by an instinctive tendency to simplify and unify things, men set themselves to delimit the number of these spiritual beings of whom their imagination had been so prodigal. "Instead of a separate spirit for every individual tree, they came to conceive of a god of the woods in general, a Silvanus or what not; instead of personifying all the winds as gods, each with his distinct character and features, they imagined a single god of the winds, an Æolus, for example, who kept them shut up in bags and could let them out at pleasure to lash the sea into fury.

To put it otherwise, the innumerable multitude of spirits of demons was generalized and reduced to a comparatively small number of deities; animism was replaced by polytheism."

Subsequently, urged still by the same craving for unity, men out of a polytheism educed monotheism. "The many gods who had long divided among them the sway of the world were deposed in favor of one solitary deity, the maker and controller of all things" (p. 10). We do not care to quote more of Mr. Frazier's fanciful story of an evolving monotheism. Reverence due to God, no less than to historical truth, forbids. The semi-sarcastic play at witticisms which pervades it may have served to wake up a Gifford audience, but it is quite out of place in a work of sober science.

The author utilizes to apparent advantage an analogy which he draws from the history of physical science. The tendency of the mind to simplify upon which he so greatly relies urged the early Greek philosophers to reduce the multitude and diversity of natural phenomena to a simple principle, which some held to be water, others air, fire, or what not. Others less ambitious were content to postulate the existence of four ultimate elements, earth, air, fire, and water. This view of the constituents of the universe lasted well into modern times. Until quite lately chemists have found it necessary to number eighty-eight irreducibles, with four more in the background awaiting discovery.

On the other hand the unquenchable thirst for unity has urged contemporary physicists to bunch the whole four-score and twelve into one. The supposed simple atoms have suddenly revealed their startling complexities, but they have likewise suggested their fundamental homogeneity. The whole cosmos is now supposed to be nothing more than hydrogen, its atoms bound together by negative electrons. The latter seem to be bits of ether, into which possibly hydrogen itself may be ultimately resolved. Then we shall be near where Anaximenes and Heraclitus stood when they said that all things are not indeed gas, hydrogen gas, but simply air, fire—perhaps "hot-air".

So too in biology the urge toward unification is reducing all living organisms to a single simple type. Naturally religion must have been subjected to the same powers of simplification. To early man all nature was alive with fairies, sprites, gods. He was then an animist. Subsequently he grouped these ghostly beings into classes. He was then a polytheist. Later still, urged by the inevitable craving for unity, he reduced them all to one. He invented Monotheism. This trend of ideas illustrated by the analogy drawn from the evolution of science controls Mr. Frazier's view of the genesis of religion. The present volume, to which there will be a sequel, con-

taining, it is hoped, the badly needed index, seems to deal entirely with the polytheistic stage, and to show man in most parts of the globe — East, South, West, the Vedic Indians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Chinese, Assyrians, Babylonians, American Indians, and the rest—all engaged in the worship of the sky, the earth, the sun.

As one peruses these pages, bristling everywhere with innumerable facts, curious fancies, crude superstitions, poetical sentiments, perfervid emotions, *et id genus omne,* one cannot help thinking how easily Sir James Frazier might have taken a route quite the opposite to that which he has here followed; how he might just as plausibly have brought an equally rich store of erudition, together with his power of vivid description and grace of literary art, to bear in favor of the contrary thesis; namely, that Monotheism, not Animism, was the primitive religion. How much more effectively he might have made the analogy suggested by the history of physical science to illustrate such a position.

The ancient philosophers held to a single principle back of the complexities of nature. Primitive man recognized one God as the efficient and final cause of the universe: original Monotheism. Philosophers subsequently started to multiply the primordial elements. Primitive man began to multiply gods; at first a few, then later deities innumerable: Polytheism, followed by Animism. Lastly, physicists in their inevitable gravitation toward a centre of unity reduced the number of elements, which they had gradually multiplied, more and more until they at length are now converging upon a unitary element. In like manner the gods many and countless were abandoned under the light of Christian revelation and of sound philosophy, so that once again the most enlightened nations of the world worship but one only God, Creator and Sovereign Lord of all things visible and invisible. All this and much more on similar lines Mr. Frazier might just as easily have established and confirmed with just as imposing a weight of facts and legends as he has here accumulated in an effort to bolster up his favorite thesis. At the same time he might with much greater erudition and literary distinction have proved that the three stages which he so nicely sets apart were within historic times never actually separate one from the others, nor sequent in time. No more than Comte's three famous gradations of knowledge were successive, were Mr. Frazier's stages in the supposed evolution of religion a series. Monotheism, Polytheism, Animism were in ancient historic times synchronous. Polytheism and Animism never superseded the earlier Monotheism—a fact which is confirmed by the history of the African cults as shown by Mgr. Le Roy's authoritative treatise, *La Religion des Primitifs.*

HANDBUCH ZUR BIBLISCHEN GESCHICHTE. Fuer den Unterricht in Kirche und Schule. Achte neu bearbeitete Auflage. Vol. I. Altes Testament: Dr. Joseph Selbst, Paepstl. Praelat; und Dr. Edmund Kalt, Professoren am Priesterseminar in Mainz. Vol. II. Neues Testament: Dr. Joseph Schaefer, Paepst. Praelat und Prof. am Priesterseminar zu Mainz. Mit Bildern und Tafeln. – Freiburg, Brisg. B. Herder Book Co.: St. Louis, Mo. 1926.

Readers of German possess a marked advantage in being able to follow progress in Scriptural studies. These two volumes are the latest and for pastoral service, including the Bible Introduction courses in our high schools and seminaries, most satisfactory manuals at the command of teacher and student which we have seen. For over eighty years the work has kept its hold in the schools of Germany, with steady attention to the progress of Scriptural studies in the various departments of the experimental sciences which throw light upon the original meaning of the inspired message.

Dr. Schuster began the work in 1861 as a commentary to his Bible History. Ten years later Dr. Holzammer gave the manual fresh value by adapting it to a wider apologetic purpose. With four succeeding editions the appeal to the educated reader of the Bible grew and justified itself by thoughtful adaptation to the progress of linguistic, geographical, and archeological knowledge.

Soon after the death of the Mayence professor, in 1903, the work was taken up with the same progressive spirit by Dr. Selbst. With him the present editors have since then labored to keep the book on the level of modern research, with a just recognition of all that the divine deposit of God's Church contains and demands.

The method which the authors follow is that of sound pedagogic science. We get a clear and succinct statement of the purpose of the Bible, its origin and development, the guarantees of its trustworthiness as a written inspired record of divine truth. The eternal principles, their historic illustration, perfected by a revelation of supernatural truths upon which divine law and precepts depend, are explained as forming the ground work of the Scriptural contents.

The purpose and nature of the Bible being established, the student is given a survey of the relation of the Bible to the evidence of nature as established by science and the experience of man manifested in history. A thorough examination of scientific systems, contrasted with hypotheses and assumptions of the rationalist methods, leads to the understanding of the authority of the inspired record, based on true historicity and authentic tradition.

In the light of these tests, which serve as a preamble to the study of the truths, facts, and laws contained in Holy Writ, the student is led to examine the Biblical teaching contained in the separate books of the Canon. Everywhere the catechetical and homiletic purpose of the matter is kept in mind. We get new light upon the various problems of man's creation, his fall and his redemption. The authors shirk no difficulty; and this is perhaps the most valuable feature of the new edition of the manual. Teutonic directness and a certain boldness of statement which we often miss in popular commentaries, under the plea that "pietas fidei" demands their being ignored, here take up difficulties and explain them on sound principles of reason.

If there is at times a certain insistence in explaining the origin, cause and development of facts of faith, which the Catholic mind may be supposed to accept without proof, we must remember that the German temper of mind moves in that way. A translation of the work for American or English readers would have to take account of this tendency and be an adaptation, condensing, omitting, and altering the genius of illustration here and there. For the rest, the two volumes by priests, who write not merely as exegetes but as teachers of pastoral theology, make this manual an admirable source for students in our theological seminaries and similar institutions.

CASUS CONSCIENTIAE, propositi ac soluti ad normam Codicis Canonici, dispositionibus Juris Hispani ac Lusitani, Decretis Concilii Plenarii Americae Latinae necnon Conc. Prov. Manilani earundemque regionum legibus peculiaribus accommodati, auctore P. Joanne B. Ferreres, S.J. multis adhuc retentis ex P. Joanne Petro Gury, S.J. Editio Quinta, Vol. I, pp. 665, Vol. II, pp. 710, Eugenius Subirana, Barcinonae. 1926.

The value of a work of this kind is incontestable. The student of Moral in the seminary can find no instrument more effectual for acquiring that science or for keeping the habit acquired ready for exercise than a collection of concrete "cases". As for the priest engaged in the sacred ministry, especially of Penance, such a work is to him a friend indeed, because it is ever at hand to meet his manifold needs. If this is true of works of the kind generally, it is particularly so of the above. While retaining many of the practical cases of Gury's well-known *Casus,* Fr. Ferreres has compiled or devised a large number covering a wide range of subjects pertaining to quite recent conditions of science and life. The cases given in relation to spiritism, telepathy, surgical operations, modern economic and political problems, etc. have obviously a special importance and

interest. The "cases", as the title indicates, are framed and solved with an eye to the civil and canonical laws prevailing in Spain, Portugal, Latin America, and the Philippine Islands. No account is taken of legal rules existing in other countries. This of course, while regrettable, was obviously an inevitable limitation. Aside from it, the work deserves the highest commendation as well for the practical character of the "cases", the reasonableness of the proposed solutions, and the clarity and vividness of the style in which they are presented. The fact that the book has reached its fifth edition may be taken as an indication that it meets a demand.

SUMMA THEOLOGICA. De novo edita, cura et studio Collegii Provinciae Tolosanae ejusdem ordinis apud S. Maximinum. Pars Prima. Andreas Blot, Paris. 1926. Pp. 1408.

The claims to attention which the present edition of the *Summa* can urge are based on the one hand on the text, and on the other on the make-up of the volume. No pains have been spared by the editor, Fr. Pègues, than whom none speaks on this matter with greater weight of authority, to secure perfect accordance with the most authentic readings. In consequence of this care certain discrepancies, which even the critical labors devoted to the Leonine text have not been able to avoid, are here amended. As regards the format, the size, weight, binding, and letterpress have been chosen so as to secure a compact, handy, durable book: one that the student will find convenient for every-day use; for quick reference; for desk or class purposes; one that the lover of St. Thomas may like to put in his pocket as a companion with whom he may want to hold converse, whether *en voyage,* or in sauntering by shady lanes, or, lastly but not least, should he wish to draw the points of his morning meditation from the *Summa,* this will be the book for his desk or prie-dieu. If he finds the paper not entirely opaque, he will recognize that this slight imperfection must be paid as part price for a pocket manual which comprises a thousand and four hundred pages whereon is impressed the entire *Prima Pars* of the *Summa* with its 119 *Quaestiones* and 485 articles. Where else can he find so great weight of gold within so portable a purse! The other portions of the *Summa* are to appear later in five additional volumes.

LE POINT DE DEPART DE LA METAPHYSIQUE — Leçons sur le developpement historique et théorique du problème de la connaissance par J. Maréchal, S.J., Docteur en Sciences, Professeur de Philosophie au Collège Philosophique et Théologique de la Compagnie de Jésus à Louvain. Editions du Museum Lessianum, Louvain; Librairie Felix Alcan, Paris (VI), 1926. Cahier V, pp. 482.

The starting-point of metaphysics as conceived by St. Thomas and the other great Scholastics as a whole was not the *subject* but the *object*. Not uncritically but with his profound intuition into the workings of the human spirit the Angelic Doctor—the title which here best expresses the depth of that intuition—was possessed by the certitude that the intellect in the light of objective evidence does really, albeit imperfectly, grasp the essence of the sense object presented to it by the "phantasm"—the imaginational representation. At the same time he was perfectly aware that the intellect perceives the essence in and by the interior idea—the *verbum intellectum*—which the intellect itself forms once it has been stimulated to action by the accompanying presence of the "phantasm". Here as always St. Thomas holds the balance even between the objective and the subjective elements in the cognitional process. But that balance, which began to vacillate with the decaying Scholasticism of the fourteenth century, and to tilt much more in the following centuries, received its definitive set on the purely subjective side of the knowledge process in the Kantian Epistemology. The *Critique of Pure Reason* claims to prove that we can never know the essence of anything, since the principle of knowledge is a subjective form wholly native to the mind itself. From Kant onward Modern Philosophy has lost its objective bearings and drifts hither and thither, tossed by every wind and wave of subjective idealism, scepticism, positivism, agnosticism, modernism—what not. Nothing more need be said to suggest the importance of the undertaking which Fr. Mareçhal has in hand—namely, the thorough all-around study of the knowledge process with a view to establish on firm foundations the objective validity of intellectual knowledge and consequently the assured starting-point of metaphysics: which after all must be the starting-point of all science, physical, philosophical, and likewise theological. Beginning in the first volume of his treatise with an examination of the ancient Greek and medieval theories, and passing onward in the subsequent cahiers through modern philosophy to Kant, he arrives in the present fifth volume of the course at a comparative study of the Kantian and the Thomist epistemologies. The fourth volume, to be devoted to the Absolute Idealism of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, has

not been issued yet, and the sixth, to deal with contemporary solutions of the knowledge problem, is in course of preparation. The matter of the volume at hand is of too technical a nature to be discussed within the limits of the present notice.

Suffice it to say that the author has succeeded in getting into the consciousness of St. Thomas and examining with him the factors, subjective and objective, of the knowledge process; and proving with him the indispensable necessity of both factors in order to lay any secure foundation for science. While the first purpose of the work is expository, the second is polemical, viz., the refutation of the Kantian views which rely in the first place on the asserted antinomies of metaphysics, and in the second place on the impossibility under which reason is supposed to labor in getting at objective reality. While sifting out whatever grains of truth the Kantian theories contain, Fr. Mareçhal claims that the more adequate explanation of science and the answer to the Kantian errors are to be found in the Thomism here expounded.

The work as far as it is completed is the most thorough attempt to solve the epistemological problem that has come under the reviewer's notice.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS, Codici Juris Canonici et Decretis Concilii Plenarii Americae Latinae, necnon juribus civilibus Galliae, Hispaniae, Lusitaniae et Americae Latinae accommodatum. Auctore Jos. Umbach, S.J. Vol. I. B. Herder Book Co., Friburgi Brisg. et St. Louis. 1926. Pp. xvi—487.

Manuals of moral theology, following the promulgation of the new Code of Canon Law, while they maintain the traditional scientific method of stating and commenting upon the rules of human conduct for attaining eternal happiness, differ but little unless it be in their interpretation of duty. That interpretation takes its keynote from one or other of the great masters of the theological schools represented by the various religious Orders—Dominicans, Franciscans, Augustinians, Jesuits, Redemptorists, and others. Occasionally a theological writer like Sebastiani sums up the principles of moral theology in eclectic fashion without pronounced allegiance. The national element rarely enters into such study so as to cause a distinct preference or exclusion.

P. Ubach's text, which covers the treatise on general moral law, together with what is styled preceptive theology, namely the decalogue, the ecclesiastical precepts, and the obligations of the clerical and religious life, presents the anomaly of a work published in Ger-

many by a German theologian for the Latin countries of France, Spain, and the Spanish South American republics. While the author adheres to the decisions of the Code and the Latin Councils, with interpretations of Ferreres, Genicot, Vermeersch, Creusen, Palmieri, Ballerini, and Busenbaum, the Jesuit predecessor of St. Alphonsus, he is singularly free from that critical temper which sees offence in writers who differ from him. Moderation and clarity are qualities of this new handbook of theology, which make it a useful addition to the already popular commentaries on the new Code in the domain of moral law.

PHILOSOPHIA NATURALIS IN USUM SCHOLARUM. Auctore Carolo Frank S.J. Herder & Co., Friburgi Brisgoviae. 1926. Pp. xv-365.

The present manual fills the place formerly held by Fr. Haan's volume on Natural Philosophy in the series of text books adapted *in usum scholarum* by the Jesuits of the German province. It is an entirely new and independent work, bringing the subject matter fairly abreast with the actual status of discovery and speculation in the domain of the physical sciences. It takes account of recent research into the electronic structure of the atom and seeks to show how the Scholastic theory of matter and form is adjustable to the newest discoveries of physics and chemistry. Albeit the author relies less than do most of his confrères upon the claim for "substantial change" in the analysis and synthesis of the inorganic elements. Such changes he maintains are not *demonstrated*. They are simply probable. "Mutationes corporum substantiales, quae fiant corruptione et generatione formarum, non jam certo probatae dici possunt; quare ex hac ratione compositio essentialis omnis corporis naturalis comprobari nequit cum certitudine." His main proof of hylomorphism is drawn from living organisms. "Omne corpus vivum constat ex duobus principiis realiter distinctis, corporali, quod est potentiale, et vitali, quod illud in ratione entis viventis actuat. Corpora elementaria anorganica esse similiter composita variis rationibus solide probatum dici potest." The fact and the theories of organic evolution are treated with relative thoroughness. Though rejecting, of course, the outdated hypothesis of Darwin and Lamarck, the author defends a theory of evolution which would include the "systematic types" of organic nature but would exclude the natural, the "essential species". In order to round out the discussion of the evolutional problem, the origin of man is introduced, although the latter subject is usually relegated to Metaphysical Psychology.

Man's origin as such, he maintains, cannot be explained by any evolutionary hypothesis. As regards the human organism, not only

can no adequate reason be found for such an hypothesis, but on the contrary the evolutionary process is here entirely impossible. "Hypothesis docens hominem simpliciter ut talem sumptum evolutione esse ortum ex aliquo ente animali repugnat; hypothesis vero, quae positive postulat applicationem theoriae generalis evolutionis ad corpus humanum, arbitrarie proponitur, immo pariter repugnare dicenda est." The arguments for this position are, it need hardly be said, philosophically sound and solid. That they will convince non-Scholastic and therefore non-Catholic critics is another question. Perhaps the mentality of this latter class is impervious to arguments from such a source.

Be this as it may, it would be hard to find a treatment not only of the evolutionary problem but of any of the other topics falling within the limits of Natural Philosophy that could be carried out more objectively, judiciously, temperately. Looking at a Philosophy of Nature ideally, one would be warranted in expecting the problem of origins to be treated. Whence comes nature — the universe, its original matter, and whence and how the organization thereof—these questions would seem to be essential to a Philosophy of Nature. On the other hand, they are intimately connected with the Theistic arguments and may therefore be relegated to Natural Theology.

One could wish that something more explicit had been said regarding the chemical elements, especially as to their possible homogeneity and resultance from one or a few primordial substances; probably ether, and hydrogen. Might the probability or physical possibility of some such original unity be suggested, however, by the conclusion wherein, by the way, is likewise summed up the genuine philosophical character of the whole treatise and its accordance with veridical modern science? "Habentur initio corpora vere elementaria, i. e. quae ipsa ex aliis non orta sunt, ex quibus vero omnia alia oriuntur. In neutro casu habentur *transmutationes essentiales,* sed potentiarum successiva actuatio. Corpora anorganica absolvunt cursum suum eo quod ex finalitate naturae complicatiora semper efformant corpora composita; organica eo quod magis magisque, fragmentatione potentiarum in ipsis contentarum, differentiantur, aliis verbis, quod typus aliquis exemplaris semper magis variatur. *Ipsa hac immutabilitate essentiali elementorum* utriusque regni fit, ut mundus a Deo creatus, non obstantibus continuis alterationibus, semper tamen essentialiter persistat; est in omni momento historico idem mundus, sed alteratus et perfectior." We give this entire passage, as it may also serve as a sample of the author's Latinity, than which none could be simpler or more calculated to lessen the difficulties inherent in the subject matter.

SHINTO. The Way of the Gods in Japan. According to the printed and Unprinted Reports of the Japanese Jesuit Missionaries in the 16th and 17th Centuries. By George Schurhammer, S.J. Kurt Schroeder, Bonn and Leipsig. 1923. Pp. 212.

If with St. Thomas we define or at least describe the beautiful as *id quod visum placet* — "whatsoever when perceived begets pleasure"—he who beholds the present volume is confronted with almost a luxury of esthetic emotion. Unquestionably, it is an *edition de luxe.* With its large pages generously margined, its double columns of letter-press widely spaced, its hundred and more perfect photogravures, its dozen plates richly colored—the quarto volume is truly a thing of beauty that can hardly fail of being a permanent joy to the booklover. Seeing on the other hand such an opulence of esthetic-ism lavished upon a history of *Shinto* one is tempted to exclaim *ut quid perditio haec.* On second thought, however, recollecting the origin of a similar complaint, one quickly reacts to the consciousness that no embellishment can be too sumptuous for the encasement of documents that record the experiences of the heroes of the cross who accompanied and who trod in the footsteps of St. Francis Xavier, the Apostle of Japan as he was of the Indies. Four of these documents are enshrined in this fair casket: 1. *The Report of Captain Alvarez,* which contains the conclusion of an essay which the great Portuguese explorer, Jorge Alvarez, wrote at the request of his friend, St. Francis Xavier, and which the latter forwarded to St. Ignatius as being the first description of the newly-discovered land. It embodies a description of a Shinto sacrifice which the writer had probably himself seen at Yamagawa and which was the first information regarding Shintoism to reach Europe. 2. *The Summario dos Erros* of 1557, a detailed account of the Japanese religions wherein Shintoism is for the first time dealt with in detail. It was probably written by Fr. Cosme de Toires who accompanied Xavier to Japan in 1549. It contains interesting matter regarding Buddhism and much original detail on the Shinto cults. 3. *The Report of Fr. Baltassar Gago* of 1562, missionary of Bungo, comprises some interesting mythological details. 4. *The Report of Fr. Gaspar Vilela,* 1571, who went to Japan with Fr. Melchoir Nunez in 1556 also contains details of Shintoism.

From these and other no less reliable documentary sources, from the leading authoritative works in German by Professor K. Florenz, from Mr. B. H. Chamberlain's *Handbook for Travellers in Japan* (London, 1894), and from various Japanese authorities, the present treatise on *Shin-To* is mainly drawn. It covers in succession the mythological and the historical periods; and elaborates the details of

the Shinto deification of nature, its veneration of the Mikado, the main features of Shinto worship and its ethical code—if that can be called ethics which sums up human duty in the maxim: "Follow your natural impulses and obey the Mikado's decrees" (p. 153). Not the least valuable portion of the book from a scenic and geographical point of view is the detailed explanation of the numerous illustrations. While the work appeals mostly to the student of History of Religions, the general reader will find it of cultural value. It shows how a nation may attain to a high degree of material success even though its so-called religion does not rise beyond the worship of nature's forces and indeed may even descend as low as the worship of evil spirits; for unless the early missionaries were greatly mistaken, Shintoism is or was impregnated with Satanism. That the *dii gentium erant daemonia* seems to be abundantly established by these documents. Probably the modern Japanese would not accept this verdict, seeing especially that Kato, their leading Shinto authority, maintains that "the cult of the *Mikado* constitutes the very soul and inner being of Shintoism" (p. 125).

It should be noted that the text of the present volume is printed in German and English arranged in parallel columns. The text is edited with valuable references and annotations. There is also a thorough index.

WHEN THE WORLD WAS WHITE WITH MAY. By Mother M. Germaine, M.A., a Sister Servant of the Immaculate Heart of Mary. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1925. Pp. 367.

Whether the world in the stormy years of the opening fifth century can in any historically justified sense be said to deserve the figurative allusion conveyed by the present title, and whether King Arthur and his chivalrous knights were wont to gather in those early times about the Round Table to tell their tales of loyalty and heroism—these are questions for the antiquary or the historian for whom facts and dates are more important than the dreams of romance. Undoubtedly it was May-time in the sense that the growing faith was then at its springtide. Moreover it was the May-time spirit that jubilated in the soul and the lives of the characters who play their allotted parts in the beautiful story told by Mother Germaine in the book itself. Surely too there was May-time in the incidents of the life of Mary which it narrates. And certainly the spirit of the May month sang itself into the breast of the brave white Knight, Cedric de Ganis, when he pledged himself to bear the jewels, the precious gift which King Arthur's one-time wife, dying as the Abbess of Aimesbury, across seas and lands to the Patriarch of Jerusalem as her penitential offering to the Holy Sepulchre.

Setting sail from Avalon's harbor and landing at Ostia, Cedric journeys to Rome, whose monuments and shrines he visits, and at the same time forms the acquaintance of distinguished nobles and fair ladies. With them he travels to Constantinople where the precious jewels which had been stolen from him in Rome are recovered. The whole party unite in a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. They visit the hallowed spots and through the papers prepared by the several members of the party descriptive of the sacred scenes and the historical personages associated therewith—papers read at the halting-places of the pilgrimage — a considerable amount of interesting information, historical and topographical, is introduced. A bit of romance lends an additional interest, culminating in the marriage of Cedric to Basila Frangipani in St. Peter's on the return to Rome. It is again the glorious May-time in Britain. The Abbey lands of Aimesbury are greening and all the fruit trees are in blossom when Cedric and Basila renew their undying troth at the tomb of the Queen Abbess Guinevere. It is a beautiful story, simple, pure, elevating, and in many ways spontaneously educative. Convent school girls and indeed young maidens generally as well as grown-ups will be the better and the wiser for reading Mother Germaine's idyl of times and scenes wherein, as she paints them, "the world was white with May".

Literary Chat

The Archdiocesan Seminary of Cincinnati, following the example of Dunwoodie, New York, is inaugurating a definite system of literary training for its theological students which is bound to increase the efficiency of the pastoral as well as the professionally intellectual element of the diocesan clergy. *Seminary Studies,* issued from Mt. St. Mary Seminary of the West, presents in its first number a series of articles on topics of immediate interest to the theological student. Different branches of the seminary curriculum are represented. The papers are, one and all, well written, and must be a joy to the Archbishop who, in his official approval of the new magazine, and doubtless the inaugurator of its activity, pleads for it as fulfilling the function of a leader whereby the power of expressing themselves "faultlessly, clearly and logically" is developed in the young ecclesiastics, through the medium of the written word.

The evil of triviality and the lowering of the ideals of the priestly calling, which are grown from the habit of superficial reading, can be counteracted chiefly by training in the habit of serious study, sustained through the practice of writing in the seminary. It not only preserves the young priest from deteriorating under the influence of vulgar surroundings and tastes, but it increases his efficiency among the people to whom he is called to bring the gospel of truth and virtue, which implies the highest type of real culture. The Cincinnati Seminary is to be congratulated on its determination in this truly apostolic progress.

The subject of serious reading for clerics is not limited by the demand of philosophical and theological dis-

cussion. All kinds of information in the fields of nature, art and social life contribute to the useful store of the priestly mind's treasury, to be used in sermon, catechetical teaching and casual conversation. One of the most efficient methods of conveying or illustrating truth and goodness is humor. But humor ceases to be a virtue or a power for good when it passes into vulgarity. A clever writer in one of our leading international book reviews points out the absence of the fine qualities of humor in the *Vulgar Habit of Laughing*, which while supposed to be impetuous is also destructive of that subtle sense which is the legitimate means of carrying true humor. Thomas L. Mason in an article under the above title believes that the loud and strident horse-laugh now quite common is doomed to be eliminated through polite education.

Fr. Cathrein, the veteran Moral Philosopher, has written several booklets on spiritual subjects. Perhaps these writings are not so widely known as his scholarly works on Ethics. The latest of these ascetical opuscles treats of venial sins, how to avoid and obliterate them. (*Die lässliche Sünde und die Mittel zu ihrer Verhütung.* pp. 179. B. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis, Mo.) It is intended for educated Catholics, lay as well as clerical and religious, who are aiming at spiritual perfection. The treatment, while simple, is, needless to say, theologically *solid*, based as it is on the Fathers and the other approved masters of the spiritual life. We stress its solidity, however, chiefly as designating the author's attitude toward fundamental asceticism as standing for pure-heartedness, and as averse from premature striving after mystical experience, wherein lurk dangerous delusion and self-deception.

The clergy are doubtless appreciative of the help to the pastoral ministry provided by *Our Sunday Visitor*. The weekly entrance into the Catholic home of that widely informed and many-sidedly cultured messenger of the faith can hardly fail to exercise a beneficial influence both on parents and children. A no less powerful influence for good is the *Acolyte* which, like the *Visitor*, owes its existence to the enlightened zeal of Bishop Noll. The *Acolyte* is truly a light-bearer and a server in more than one sense and direction—a minister all the more efficient in that it waits immediately on the priest and through him on his people—*causa causae est causa causati.* It appeals both to his head and his heart, to his personal culture and to his vocational activities. And it performs its functions all the more gracefully when it uses the smoothly working instruments devised by *Peregrinus Gasolinus*. One likes to think of the *Acolyte* following the *Visitor* into every rectory throughout the land (Huntington, Ind.).

Students of Epistemology or Material Logic (Criteriology) will find in a new work by Dr. Joseph Geyser, Professor of Philosophy at the Munich University, many, if not wholly new, certainly penetrating suggestions. The title of the book, *Auf dem Kampfelde der Logik* (Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis; pp. 294) suggests the belligerent temper of the discussion. The forces in the field are on the one side the Kantians or rather Neo-Kantian Idealists or Subjectivists, and on the other the Moderate Realists. The issues at stake are concerned chiefly with the nature of the idea (*Begriff*) and the judgment (*Urtheil*), the relation of sense perception in respect to the singular, and the nature of evidence, and its bearing upon cognition both on its intellectual and its emotional, its objective and its subjective side. Into these and many other cognate aspects of the knowledge problem Professor Geyser enters profoundly, albeit in a manner too technical to permit of discussion or even of illustration in this place. It must suffice to refer the student to the work itself. He can be sure of finding many valuable suggestions, including very probably some fresh insights into the intricate recesses of the knowledge problem.

The Abbé Rouzic is well known in France through his many doctrinal treatises, all of which are characterized by sound theological thought, piety

and a graceful style. These qualities stand out markedly in his recent book, *Les Saints Ordres* (P. Téqui, Paris, pp. 522). Conceiving the priesthood as the divinely established medium between man and God, he treats of the means and methods whereby the priest is formed—vocation, the seminary, tonsure, the several orders; and then successively of the priest's sacred functions. He subtitles his book *doctrine et action*, thus marking it as the theory of the priesthood and the active work of its ministry.

"To subject the eloquence of St. John Chrysostom to statistical dissection may seem to some like an attempt to analyze a fragrance or to lose sight of the beauty of a flower in the questionable attempt to study its morphology." Dr. Frederick Dickinson recognizes this not improbable attitude of mind with which his Academic Dissertation on *The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of St. John Chrysostom* may be approached. On the other hand, he contends that minute grammatical study contributes to the vindication of the high place amongst the Greek classical writers which is due to the golden-tongued Church Father. For the rest, Dr. Dickinson's Dissertation which he submitted to the Faculty of the Catholic University in view of the Doctorate of Philosophy, is an admirable specimen of critical erudition. It reflects credit on the author's scholarliness and is fully abreast with the high standard of excellence which we have been taught by experience to expect from the Catholic University. (The Catholic University Press, pp. 196.)

The recent tendency amongst editors and publishers to reissue the classics both pagan and Christian in modern formats is to be applauded. Of the latter group—the Christian, that is the spiritual classics—we welcome especially two. First, the writings of the Abbot Blosius. Every one at all conversant with ascetical literature has met with "the devout Blosius"; but probably not so many know anything about the man, the monk, and his writings. Quite recently Father Bertrand Wilberforce, O.P., has translated and edited *Consolatio Pusillanimorum*, "Comfort for the Faint-hearted". The book is prefaced by a brief account of Blosius and his writings.

Comfort for the Faint-Hearted is remarkable for the profundity of its insight into human nature, its intimate knowledge and experience of God's dealings with souls, the consoling nature of its spiritual guidance and the simple transparency of its style. The latter quality has been most successfully secured in the present translation. Priests who have to deal with troubled souls — and what priest has not?—will find an abundance of helpful suggestions in this little book. And once they have used it themselves they will want to spread it widely amongst their penitents. It is published in a handy format by Benziger Brothers (New York, pp. 255).

Another reprint of a spiritual classic of the seventeenth century is entitled *The Blind Obedience of an Humble Penitent* by Sylvester Jenks, a Benedictine monk, one-time Professor at Douay and subsequently missionary in England. He died as bishop-elect of Gallipolis, 1714. The original of the opuscle now reissued was published in England, 1698. The present reprint is edited with an Introduction by Dom Roger Hudleston, of Downside Abbey, and is issued in a pocket-size booklet by Benziger Brothers (pp. 157). As a guide for the scrupulously inclined penitent it is unsurpassed—one of its outstanding merits being its quaint humor, which is an infectious virus that "takes" unwittingly.

Apropos of the Prohibition controversy—which refuses to be downed or drowned, as the Conference pages of the last number reconfirm—a brochure issued by the Universal Knowledge Foundation (New York, pp. 14) deserves attention. Emanating from the pen of the Rev. Lucian Johnston, both its fact and its thought elements may be relied upon. Dr. Johnston deals briefly with the general principles from which any fruitful discussion of the question must proceed, and more at length with the history of the Pro-

hibition movement, both at home and abroad. He recognizes the good it has effected by abolishing the saloon, but points out the evils it has entailed by its fanaticism; the feeling of resentment created by it and the startling impetus it has given to the invasion of personal liberties by the State; and by spreading the very abuses of alcohol to prevent which it had been devised by its authors and promoted by its champions. Dr. Johnston does not discuss the moral obligation of the law, but he does call attention to the serious troubles its fanatical promoters may engender as regards the Holy Sacrifice.

Students who have made acquaintance whether directly, or indirectly through the review in these pages, with the first volume of the *Tractatus Historico-Dogmaticus de Ecclesia* by the learned Jesuit theologian P. Hermann Dieckmann, will be interested in knowing that the second volume has been issued. Its general subject is the *magisterium Ecclesiae*. In a goodly octavo of some three hundred pages the author develops the Fundamental Theology of the nature, the organ, the subject-matter and sources of the Church's teaching function; the nature and properties of the Church; and her relation to Christ and to the Blessed Trinity. Having previously dilated on the merits of the first volume, we need do no more than observe that the second volume in all respects sustains the high standard set by its predecessor. (B. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis, Mo.)

No less praise is due to the *Praelectiones Apologeticae de Ecclesia Catholica* by P. Reginald M. Schultes, O. P., Professor at the Dominican College de Angelico, Rome. Though written primarily for the use of the author's own students, the excellence of the work in respect to matter, method and style commends it as serviceable to students and professors of theology generally. (Pp. 784. Paris, Lethielleux.)

While theological treatises such as those just mentioned cover substantially the same ground and differ only in secondary matters, there have recently appeared several works that deal with a relatively new aspect of theology. We refer to the history and so-called evolution of dogma. For although some of the great theologians before and after the Council of Trent touch upon these themes, it is only lately that they have become systematically developed as branches of the theological organism. The Roman Dominican above mentioned, P. Schultes, has recently prepared and issued through Lethielleux (Paris) a very solid work entitled *Introductio in Historiam Dogmaticum*, containing his *Praelectiones* at the Angelico from 1911 to 1922. The book must not be aligned with the history of dogmas, excellent treatises on which have been written in English by Fr. Otten, S.J., and in French (English translation) by P. Tixeront. Professor Schultes deals with the nature of dogmatic truth, its general history and particularly with its development—showing in what sense and how Catholic doctrine is capable of "evolution". Though the learned Dominican calls his treatise an *Introductio*, he has within its three hundred and fifty pages been able to condense a considerable range of theological science—condense it without sacrifice of clarity or interest.

A notable work on the same subject by another Dominican theologian, P. Marin-Sola, Professor at Freiburg in Switzerland, appeared in Spanish about three years ago and was subsequently translated into French by a Marist theologian, P. Basile Cambon, and published in two stately octavos under the title, *L'Evolution Homogène du Dogme Catholique* (1924. 2e Edit. Freiburg. Librarie de l'Œuvre de S. Paul). This is a treatise with a wide range of material and a very thorough analysis. The author contends that "evolution" is a term of vivid significance and ought not to be left to the abuses of the sciolists, but taken up in its right and pertinent sense and consecrated to higher and legitimate uses. How, in what sense, with what limitations it is applicable to Catholic beliefs Père Marin-Sola explains very fully, lucidly and interestingly.

The late Dom Louismet was an adept at making the mystical life simple and attractive, as it should be. In a septette of successive small volumes and in an incomparably smooth and easy style he made the various stages and practices of contemplation intelligible and inspiring. The last, the seventh of the series, is entitled the *Burning Bush*. In it the devout Benedictine develops the methods whereby the willing soul may reach an intimate union with the Blessed Trinity. God in Himself, in Nature, in the Heart of the Mystic — under these headings he pours out a wealth of spiritual truth, drawn largely from the Bible, and clothes it with imagery that assures it an entrance to and a hold on the intellect and thereby on the affections and the will. What an authority so unbiased in regard to Catholic faith and practice as the *Occult Review* says of Dom Louismet's *Mystical Initiation* may be applied to his latest work, *The Burning Bush:* "The atmosphere of this literary treasure is as fragrant as the south wind that blows across the garden of the devout soul." (Pp. 260. Kenedy & Sons, N. Y.)

Books on Civics are expected to be arid. One doesn't go to them for flowers or luscious fruits. Facts and figures are their specialties. Nevertheless there are exceptions. One of them is *This Country of Mine,* by C. E. Magill, who was formerly a teacher of *Civics* and kindred branches at various educational institutions. Except probably Holt's *Talks on Civics,* the present writer has seen no book on *Civics* that fulfills its purpose more completely and at the same time more agreeably. The author is evidently a born teacher—*nascitur non fit magister.* He knows how to combine theory with practice in just proportions: how to make the useful attractive, we had almost said sweet. It would be hard to find the nature, functions, methods, and so on of American government and citizenship more clearly or pleasantly explained. If any one wants a succinct manual on these subjects, whether for the school-room or for his own personal use, he will make no mistake in selecting *This Country of Mine.* Just one thing is wanting—an index. The manual is furnished with a number of helpful maps, a perfect diagrammatic analysis of the Constitution, and a variety of comely photogravures. It is neatly made by the Loyola Press, Chicago. (Pp. 330).

Books Received

SCRIPTURAL.

THE BIBLE: ITS HISTORY, AUTHENTICITY AND AUTHORITY. Treated in a Series of Lectures by Catholic Scholars, delivered at Aberdeen, 1924-1925, under Auspices of Aberdeen Diocesan Branch of Catholic Truth Society of Scotland. Sands & Co., London and Edinburgh; B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis and London. 1926. Pp. 200. Price, $1.35.

DIATESSARON seu Concordia Quatuor Evangeliorum in Unum Redactorum cum Notis Exegeticis, Dogmaticis, Asceticis, Historicis, etc. Auctore Exc.mo D. Fr. Alexio Maria Lépicier, Ord. Serv. B.M.V. Vol. I: Ab Incarnatione ad secundum Pascha vitae publicae Iesu Christi Domini Nostri. Cum introductione in studium concordiae sanctorum Evangeliorum. Vol. II: A secundo Paschate vitae publicae Domini Nostri Iesu Christi ad festum Encaeniorum post tertium Pascha. Typographia Pontificia, Romae; B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. Pp. xlviii—512 et viii—588. Pretium, $3.25.

HANDBUCH ZUR BIBLISCHEN GESCHICHTE. Für Unterricht in Kirche und Schule. Achte neu bearbeitete Auflage. I. Band: Das Alte Testament. Bearbeitet von Dr. Prof. Joseph Selbst und Dr. Edmund Kalt, Priester Seminar Mainz. II. Band: Das Neue Testament. Bearbeitet von Dr. Prof. Jakob Schaefer, Priester Seminar Mainz. Mit Bildern und Tafeln. B. Herder Book Co., Freiburg, Brisg. und St. Louis. 1926. S. xviii—874 und 782. Preis, $14.00.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

THE NEW CHURCH LAW ON MATRIMONY. Second Amplified and Revised Edition. By the Rev. Joseph J. C. Petrovits, I.C.D., S.T.D. Introduction by the Right Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D.D., Rector of Catholic University of America. John Joseph McVey, Philadelphia. 1926. Pp. xvi—511. Price, $6.00.

LITURGICAL SERMONETTES FOR CHILDREN'S MASS ON SUNDAYS OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR. By the Rev. Frederick A. Reuter. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis and London. 1926. Pp. 296. Price, $2.25.

ORDINATION RETREAT. By the Right Rev. Pierre Dadolle, Bishop of Dijon. Authorized translation from the French by the Rev. S. A. Raemers, M.A. John Murphy Co., Baltimore. 1926. Pp. 95. Price, $0.75 *net.*

A PRAYER TO THE LITTLE FLOWER. Words of Refrain by a Dominican Sister from Poem by Mary E. Mannix. Music by Mrs. Nellie Lahiff, 201 W. 106th St., New York. 1925. Pp. 2.

NIRVANA. Par Louis de la Vallée Poussin. (*Études sur l'Histoire des Religions,* 4.) Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris. 1925. Pp. xxiii—194. Prix, 9 *fr.*

OUR LADY, MEDIATRIX OF ALL GRACES. By Raphael V. O'Connell, S.J. John Murphy Co., Baltimore. 1926. Pp. 121. Price, $1.25 *net.*

LITTLE ATLAS OF CATHOLIC MISSIONS. With twenty maps. Society for Propagation of the Faith, New York. 1926. Pp. 110. Price, $0.25; $17.50 a hundred.

CHRIST, THE IDEAL OF THE MONK. Spiritual Conferences on Monastic and Religious Life. By the Right Rev. D. Columba Marmion, O.S.B., Abbot of Maredsous Abbey. Translated from French by a Nun of Tyburn Convent. Sands & Co., London and Edinburgh; B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis and London. 1926. Pp. 463. Price, $4.25.

SUMMA THEOLOGICA Sancti Thomae Aquinatis, Ordinis Praedicatorum, Doctoris Angelici et Communis Omnium Scholarum Catholicarum Patroni de Novo Edita, Cura et Studio Collegii Provinciae Tolosanae Eiusdem Ordinis apud S. Maximinum. Prima Pars. Parisiis: Andre Blot. 1926. Pp. xxx—1408.

LA VIE CHRÉTIENNE. Extraits des Œuvres de Saint Augustin. Par le R. P. Antonin Tonna-Barthet, O.E.S.A. Traduction autorisée. Maison de la Bonne Presse, Paris. 1925. Pp. xii—807.

IKONOGRAPHIE DER HEILIGEN. Von Dr. Karl Künstle, Prof. an der Universität Freiburg. Mit 284 Bildern. B. Herder Book Co., Freiburg, Brisg., St. Louis und London. S. 605. Preis, $11.50.

PIUS XI. RUNDSCHREIBEN ÜBER DIE FÖDERUNG DER MISSION. Latin and German Text. B. Herder Book Co., Freiburg, Brisg., St. Louis und London. S. 48. Preis, $0.45.

MEDITATIONS FOR ADVENT AND CHRISTMAS. By Mother Clare Fey, Foundress of the Congregation of the Poor Child Jesus. Translated from the German by a Member of the Congregation. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1926. Pp. x—277. Price, $2.25 *net.*

HISTOIRE DE NOTRE-DAME DE LOURDES. D'après les Documents et les Témoins. Par L.-J.-M. Cros, S.J. I: Les Apparitions (11 février—7 avril 1858). Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris. 1925. Pp. xxviii—528. Prix, 33 *fr. franco.*

ST. ANTHONY OF PADUA. According to His Contemporaries. By Ernest Gilliat-Smith. J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., London and Toronto; E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. 1926. Pp. 223. Price, $2.50.

HERRLICHKEITEN DER SEELE. Mystik des Auslandes. Von Dr. Alfons Heilmann. B. Herder Book Co., Freiburg, Brisg. und St. Louis. S. 390. Preis, $2.25.

LITTLE BROTHER FRANCIS OF ASSISI. By Michael Williams. Macmillan Co., New York. 1926. Pp. 188. Price, $1.75.

COMFORT FOR THE FAINT-HEARTED (*Consolatio Pusillanimium*). By Ludovicus Blosius. Translated from the Latin by Bertrand A. Wilberforce, of the Order of Preachers. (*The Works of Louis de Blois,* commonly called Ludovicus Blosius. Vol. II.) Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1926. Pp. xxxviii—217. Price, $1.25 *net.*

THE BLIND OBEDIENCE OF AN HUMBLE PENITENT. The Best Cure for Scruples. By Sylvester Jenks, Bishop-Elect of Callipolis. Edited, with an Introduction, by Dom Roger Hudleston, Monk of Downside Abbey. (*The Orchard Books.* Extra Series, No. 2.) Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1926. Pp. xix—119. Price, $1.00 *net.*

THE SAINTS OF ASSISI. Francis and Clare, with Juniper and Giles, Friars Minor. By E. Saulsbury. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1926. Pp. vii—259. Price, $2.25 *net.*

PIUS XI. RUNDSCHREIBEN über d. Fest Jesu Christi des Konigs, und Apostolische Konstitution über Ausdehnung d. Jubilaeum's auf den ganzen Erdkreis. B. Herder Book Co., Freiburg, Brisg. und St. Louis. 1926. S. 66. Preis, $0.55.

THE EUCHARIST, LAW AND PRACTICE. By Canon P. Durieux, D.D., J.C.D. Translated by the Rev. Oliver Dolphin. Preface by the Most Rev. Austin Dowling, D.D. The Rev. Oliver Dolphin, Faribault, Minn. 1926. Pp. 239.

THE BENEDICTINES. By Edouard Schneider. Authorized translation from the French by the Rev. Johan Liljencrants, Ph.D., S.T.D. (*The Great Monastic Orders Series.*) Greenberg, Publisher, Inc., New York. 1926. Pp. 222. Price, $2.00.

DIE LÄSSLICHE SÜNDE und Mittel zu ihrer Verhütung. Für gebildete Katholiken. Von Viktor Cathrein, S.J. B. Herder Book Co., Freiburg, Brisg. und St. Louis. S. 166. Preis, $1.00.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST IN ART. By P. D. Corbinian Wirz, O.S.B. 97 illustrations. Translated by T. J. Kennedy. B. Kühlen, M. Gladbach, Germany. 1913. Pp. 79. Price, $0.50 *net.*

SCRUPLES. Words of Consolation. By the Rev. Patrick J. Gearon, O.C.C., D.D., B.A. Appreciation by J. B. Magennis, M.B., Physician, Dublin. The Talbot Press, Dublin and Cork; B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. Pp. 137. Price, $1.00.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS, Codici Juris Canonici et Decretis Concilii Plenarii Americae Latinae, necnon Juribus Civilibus Galliae, Hispaniae, Lusitaniae et in plerisque Nationibus Americae Latinae vigentibus accommodatum. Auctore Josepho Umbach, S.J. Vol. I continens Theologiam Moralem Generalem et ex Speciali Tractatus de Praeceptis Decalogi, de Communioribus Praeceptis Ecclesiae et de Obligationibus Status Clericalis et Religiosi. B. Herder Book Co., Friburgi, Brisg. et St. Louis. 1926. Pp. 487. Pretium, $2.85.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS ad Normam Codicis Canonici, Dispositionibus Iuris Hispani, ac Lusitani, Decretis Concilii Plenarii Americae Latinae, necnon I Conc. Prov. Manilani Earundemque Regionum Legibus Peculiaribus etiam Civilibus Accommodatum. Auctore P. Ioanne B. Ferreres, S.I. Editio tertia decima, sexta post Codicem, correctior et auctior. Eugenius Subirana, Barcinone. 1925. Pp. lii—779 et xvi—917.

FACULTATES APOSTOLICAE quas Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide delegare solet Ordinariis Missionum. Commentaria in Formulam Tertiam. Auctore G. Vromant, C.I.C.M. de Scheut. (*Museum Lessianum*—Section Théologique N° 16. Publications dirigées par des Pères de la Compagnie de Jésus, Louvain.) Editions du Museum Lessianum ou E. Desbarax, Louvain; Giraudon ou Casterman, Paris; A. Dewit, Bruxelles. 1926. Pp. vi—165. Pretium, 8 *fr.* 50.

THE EUCHARISTIC RENAISSANCE, or The International Eucharistic Congresses. By Thomas M. Schwertner, O.P., Editor of *The Rosary Magazine*. Macmillan Co., New York. 1926. Pp. xiii—368. Price, $2.00.

ST. ANTHONY OF PADUA ACCORDING TO HIS CONTEMPORARIES. By Ernest Gilliat-Smith. J. M. Dent & Sons, London and Toronto; E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. 1926. Pp. 223. Price, 6/- *net*.

THE MANICHEES AS ST. AUGUSTINE SAW THEM. By Joseph Rickaby, S.J. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1925. Pp. vi—56. Price, $0.50 *net*.

HISTORY OF THE SOCIETY OF THE MISSIONARIES OF THE SACRED HEART and the Mission Workers of the Sacred Heart. Sacred Heart Monastery, Aurora, Ills. Pp. 48.

JESUS, OUR EUCHARISTIC KING. Words and Music by Mrs. Nellie Lahiff, 201 W. 106th St., New York. 1926. Pp. 2.

FIDELIS OF THE CROSS, JAMES KENT STONE. By Walter George Smith, A.M., LL.D., K.S.G., and Helen Grace Smith. With fourteen illustrations. G. P. Putnam Sons, New York and London. 1926. Pp. 467.

THE LAST SUPPER AND CALVARY. A Treatise. By the Rev. Alfred Swaby, O.P. Edited, with Preface and Introduction, by the Rev. Vincent McNabb, O.P. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1926. Pp. xxix—194. Price, $1.80 *net*.

SACRED ELOQUENCE. A Guide Book for Seminarians. By Charles H. Schultz, M.A., LL.D., Sacred Oratory, English, Sociology, St. Francis Seminary, Loretto, Pa. John Murphy Co., Baltimore. 1926. Pp. viii—269. Price, $2.00 *net*.

ORDRE DES OFFICES DE LA SEMAINE SAINTE À JÉRUSALEM du IV^{e} au X^{e} Siècle. Études de Liturgie et de Topographie Palestiniennes. Par le P. J.-B. Thibaut, des Augustins de l'Assomption. Maison de la Bonne Presse, Paris. 1926. Pp. 128.

VADEMECUM PROPOSED TO RELIGIOUS SOULS BY A PIOUS AUTHOR. Translation by M. S. Pine, Georgetown Visitation Convent. John P. Daleiden Co., Chicago. 1926. Pp. 140. Price, $0.35.

WESEN UND WOLLEN DER CHRISTLICHEN KUNST. Von Dr. Joseph Sauer, Prof. Univ. Freiburg. B. Herder Book Co., Freiburg, Brisg. und St. Louis. S. 22. Preis, $0.35.

A GUIDE TO THE LIFE OF OUR LORD AS RECORDED IN THE FOUR GOSPELS. Compiled by Robert Eaton, Priest of Birmingham Oratory. Sands & Co., London and Edinburgh; B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis and London. Pp. 64. Price, $0.40.

MÉDITATIONS SUR LA PERFECTION RELIGIEUSE. Pour les Augustins de l'Assomption. Par Emmanuel d'Alzon. Première Partie: Depuis la veille de Noël jusqu'à l'Octave du Saint-Sacrement. Maison de la Bonne Presse, Paris. 1925. Pp. xv—551.

MYSTERIES OF THE MASS IN REASONED PRAYERS. By Father W. Roche, S.J., author of *The House and Table of God, A Child's Prayers to Jesus, Benedictus qui Venit, The Children's Bread*. With four plates. New edition. Longmans, Green & Co., London, New York, Toronto, Bombay, Calcutta and Madras. 1926. Pp. 96. Price, $0.75.

CASUS CONSCIENTIAE Propositi ac Soluti ad Normam Codicis Canonici, Dispositionibus Iuris Hispani ac Lusitani, Decretis Concilii Plenarii Americae Latinae necnon Conc. Prov. Manilani Earundemque Regionum Legibus Peculiaribus Accommodati. Auctore P. Ioanne B. Ferreres, S.I. Multis adhuc retentis ex P. Ioanne Petro Gury, Eiusdem Societatis. Editio quinta, secunda post Codicem, correctior et novis casibus valde aucta. Eugenius Subirana, Barcinone. 1926. Pp. xvi—665 et x—710.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

FRÜHSCHEIN DER KULTUR. Bilder aus Vorzeit und Urgeschichte. Von Prof. Dr. Johannes Ledroit, Oberstudiendirektor in Bensheim. Mit 73 Bildern. B. Herder Book Co., Freiburg, Brisg., St. Louis und London. 1926. S. 257. Preis, $1.45.

THE USE OF THE OPTATIVE MOOD IN THE WORKS OF ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM. Dissertation submitted to Faculty of Letters of Catholic University of America, in partial fulfilment of requirements for degree of Doctor in Philosophy. By the Rev. Frederick Walter Augustine Dickinson, M.A. Catholic Education Press, Brookland, D. C. (*Patristic Studies,* Vol. XI.) 1926. Pp. xvi—181. Price, $2.00.

HUMANISM. By Curtis W. Reese. Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago and London. 1926. Pp. 85. Price, $1.00.

LATIN AND GREEK IN COLLEGE ENTRANCE AND COLLEGE GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS. Dissertation submitted to Faculty of School of Letters of Catholic University of America in Partial Fulfilment of Requirements for Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. By Brother Giles, M.A., of Xaverian Brothers. Catholic Education Press, Brookland, D. C. 1926. Pp. xiii—191. Price, $2.50.

THE VOCABULARY OF THE MORAL-ASCETICAL WORKS OF ST. AMBROSE. A Study in Latin Lexicography. Submitted to the Catholic Sisters College of the Catholic University of America, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. By Sister Mary Finbarr Barry, M.A., of the Sisters of St. Joseph, Brighton, Mass. (*Patristic Studies,* Vol. X.) Catholic Education Press, Brookland, D. C. 1926. Pp. xiii—287. Price, $2.00.

THOMISME ET MÉTHODE. Que devrait être un Discours de la Méthode pour avoir le droit de se dire thomiste? Par Jean Rimaud, Docteur ès lettres. (*Bibliothèque des Archives de Philosophie.*) Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris. 1925. Pp. 276—xxix. Prix, 30 *fr. franco.*

AUF DEM KAMPF-FELDE DER LOGIK. Logisch-Erkenntniss theoretische Untersuchungen von Dr. Joseph Geyser, Prof. d. Philosophie, Univ. München. B. Herder Book Co., Freiburg, Brisg. und St. Louis. 1926. S. 288. Preis, $2.15.

DIE CHRISTLICHEN SOZIALLEHREN. Von Otto Schilling. (*Der Katholische Gedanke,* Veröffentlichungen des Verbandes der Vereine Katholischer Akademiker zur Pflege der Katholischen Weltanschauung, Band XVI) Oratoriums-Verlag, Köln, München, Wien. 1926. S. 200. Preis, 4 *M.* 50.

LE POINT DE DÉPART DE LA MÉTAPHYSIQUE. Leçons sur le Développement Historique et Théorique du Problème de la Connaissance. Par J. Maréchal, S.J., Docteur en Sciences, Professeur de Philosophie au Collège Philosophique et Théologique de la Compagnie de Jésus a Louvain. Cahier V: Le Thomisme devant la Philosophie Critique. (*Museum Lessianum*—Section Philosophique. Publications dirigées par des Pères de la Compagnie de Jésus.) Museum Lessianum, Louvain; Félix Alcan, Paris (VI). 1926. Pp. xxiii—481. Prix, 25 *fr.*

VON KUNST UND KÜNSTLERN. Gedanken zu alten und neuen künstlerischen Fragen. Von Josef Kreitmaier, S.J. Mit Titelbild und Tafeln. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. 1926. S. 250. Preis, $2.85.

GESPRÄCHE MIT EINEM GOTTLOSEN. Von Kaplan Fahsel. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. 1926. S. 212. Preis, $1.75.

CATHOLIC WOMEN AND BIBLE READING. By the Rev. John J. O'Gorman, D.C.L. Catholic Truth Society of Canada, Toronto. 1926. Pp. 24. Price, $0.05.